Dynamical Systems on Networks: A Tutorial

Mason A. Porter[1,2] and James P. Gleeson[3]

[1]*Oxford Centre for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX2 6GG, UK*
[2]*CABDyN Complexity Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 1HP, UK*
[3]*MACSI, Department of Mathematics & Statistics, University of Limerick, Ireland*

We give a tutorial for the study of dynamical systems on networks, and we focus in particular on "simple" situations that are tractable analytically. We briefly motivate why examining dynamical systems on networks is interesting and important. We then give several fascinating examples and discuss some theoretical results. We also discuss dynamical systems on dynamical (i.e., time-dependent) networks, overview software implementations, and give our outlook on the field.

arXiv:1403.7663v1 [nlin.AO] 29 Mar 2014

I. PREAMBLE

The purpose of the present paper is to give a tutorial for studying dynamical systems on networks. We explicitly focus on "simple" situations that are tractable analytically, though it is also valuable to examine more complicated situations. Our article is intended for people who seek to study dynamical systems on networks but who might not have any prior experience at it. Accordingly, we hope that reading this article will convey why it is interesting and useful to study dynamical systems on networks, how one can go about doing so, the potential pitfalls that can arise in such studies, the current research frontier in the field, and important open problems.

We also hope that reading the present article will provide helpful pointers to interesting papers to read, and that it will facilitate your ability to critically read and evaluate papers concerning dynamical systems on networks. Our article is *not* a review (or anything close to one), and in particular we are citing only a small subset of the existing scholarship in this area. New articles on dynamical systems on networks are published or posted on a preprint server very frequently, so we couldn't possibly cite all of the potentially relevant articles comprehensively even if we tried.

II. INTRODUCTION: HOW DOES NONTRIVIAL NETWORK CONNECTIVITY AFFECT DYNAMICAL PROCESSES ON NETWORKS?

When studying a dynamical process, we are concerned with its behavior as a function of time, space, and its parameters. There are numerous studies that examine how many people are infected by a biological contagion and whether it persists from one season to another, whether and to what extent interacting oscillators synchronize, whether a meme on the internet becomes viral or not, and more. These studies all have something in common: the dynamics are occurring on a set of entities (*nodes* in a network) that are connected to each other via *edges* in some nontrivial way. This leads to the natural question of how such underlying nontrivial connectivity affects dynamical processes. This is one of the most important questions in network science [138], and this is the core question that we consider in the present article.

Traditional studies of continuous dynamical systems are concerned with qualitative methods to study coupled ordinary differential equations (ODEs) [87, 176] and/or partial differential equations (PDEs) [39, 41]. Dynamical processes on networks yield (large) ODE systems if the state of each node is given by its own ODE. In general, the change in state of a node depends not only on its own current state but also those of its neighbors.

Another area of particular interest is binary-state dynamics on nodes, whose states again depend on those of their neighbors, with stochastic update rules. (Dynamical processes with more than two states are obviously also interesting, but binary situations are often convenient to study because they are tractable.) Examples include simple models of disease spread, where each node is considered to be in either the healthy (*susceptible*) state or the unhealthy (*infected*) state, and infects are transmitted probabilistically along the edges of a network. One can apply approximation methods, such as mean-field approaches, to obtain (relatively) low-dimensional descriptions of the global behavior of the system—e.g., to predict the expected number of infected people in a network at a given time—and these methods can yield ODE systems that are amenable to dynamical-systems analysis.

Not only can network structure affect dynamical processes, but the latter can also affect the dynamics of networks. For example, when a child gets the flu, he/she might not go to school for a couple of days, and this temporary change in human activity affects which social contacts take place, which can in turn affect the dynamics of disease propagation. We will briefly discuss the interactions of dynamics on networks with dynamics of networks (these are sometimes called "adaptive networks" [85, 162]) in this article, but we will mostly assume static network connectivity so that we can focus on the question of how network structure affects dynamical processes that run on top of a network.

A. Other Resources

We now list several references that can complement the present article and indicate the particular directions for which we think readers will find them helpful.

- Reference [178] is a friendly introduction to dynamical systems on networks. It gives the state of play in 2001, so it is out of date in many respects. (Network science is a young, immature field that advances quickly.)
- Reference [137] is a more recent (but very short) expository article about dynamical systems on networks.
- Reference [188] is a recent review article that covers dynamical systems on networks. It is not very technical, but it provides a big-picture overview of several areas.
- Reference [138] is a very good textbook on network science in general. Some of its later chapters cover dynamical systems on networks. We drew some of our discussion of general considerations in Section V from this book, which also has thorough discussions of processes like percolation and biological contagions (and the use of mean-field theories and related ideas to study them).
- Reference [110] is a textbook on networks that takes a statistical perspective. It includes material on dynamical systems on networks.
- Reference [9] is a book devoted to dynamical systems on networks from a physics perspective.
- Reference [134] is a review on epidemic spreading in networks that focuses on moment-closure methods and discusses the challenges in generalizing methods from configuration-model networks to more complicated random-graph ensembles.
- Reference [47] is a tutorial article that discusses moment-closure approximations for discrete adaptive networks, in which a discrete dynamical system is coupled to a network that changes in discrete time. See Section V for more discussion of moment closure and Section VII for an introduction to dynamical systems on dynamical networks. Reference [162] reviews research on adaptive networks.
- Reference [26] is a review of social dynamics from the perspective of statistical physics.
- Reference [55] is a review article that discusses analytical methods to study critical phenomena on networks. It is more difficult to digest than the above articles, but it has nice discussions of phase transitions, percolation, synchronization, and many other phenomena.

B. Organization of This Article

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. Before delving into dynamics, we start by recalling a few basic concepts in Section III. In Section IV, we discuss several examples of dynamical systems on networks. In Section V, we give various theoretical considerations for general dynamical systems on networks as well as for several systems on which we focus. In Section VII, we briefly examine dynamical systems on dynamical (i.e., time-dependent) networks. We overview software implementations in Section VI. Finally, we conclude and discuss both open problems and current research efforts in Section VIII.

III. A FEW BASIC CONCEPTS

For simplicity, we will frame our discussions in terms of unweighted, undirected networks. When such a network is static, it can be represented using a symmetric adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}^T$ whose component $A_{ij} = A_{ji}$ is 1 if nodes i and j are connected (or, more properly, "adjacent") and 0 if they are not. We will also assume that $A_{ii} = 0$ for all i, so that none of our networks include self-edges. We denote the total number of nodes in a network (i.e., its "size") as N. The *degree* k_i of node i is the number of edges that are connected to it. For a large network, it is common to examine the distribution of degrees over all of its nodes. This *degree distribution* P_k is defined as the probability that a node—chosen uniformly at random from the set of all nodes—has degree k. The *mean degree* z is the mean number of edges per node and is given by $z = \sum_k kP_k$. For example, classical Erdős-Rényi (ER) random graphs have a Poisson degree distribution: $P_k = z^k e^{-z}/k!$. However, many real-world networks have right-skewed (i.e., *heavy-tailed*) degree distributions [32], so the mean degree z only provides minimal information about structure

of a network. The most popular type of heavy-tailed distribution is a *power law* [179], for which $P_k \sim k^{-\gamma}$ as $k \to \infty$ (where the parameter γ is called the "power" or "exponent"). Networks with a power-law degree distribution are often called by the misleading name of "scale-free networks", and many generative mechanisms—such as de Solla Price's model [44] and the Barabási-Albert (BA) model [8]—have been developed to produce networks with power-law degree distributions.

The effects of network structure on dynamics are often studied using a random-graph ensemble known as the *configuration model*. In this ensemble, one specifies the degree distribution P_k, but the network *stubs* (i.e., ends of edges) are then connected uniformly at random. In the limit of infinite network size, one expects a network drawn from the configuration-model ensemble to have vanishingly small *degree-degree correlations* and *clustering*. Degree-degree correlation measures the (Pearson) correlation between the degrees of nodes at each end of a randomly-chosen edge of a network. (The edge is chosen uniformly at random from the set of edges.) Degree-degree correlation can be significant, for example, if high-degree nodes are connected preferentially to other high-degree nodes. This would be true in a social network if popular people tend to be friends with other popular people, and one would describe the network as homophilous by degree. By contrast, a network for which high-degree nodes are connected preferentially to low-degree nodes is heterophilous by degree. The simplest type of clustering arises as a result of a preponderance of triangle motifs in a network. (More complicated types of clustering in networks include motifs with more than three nodes, community structure, and core-periphery structure [40, 138, 155].) Triangles are common, for example, in social networks, so the lack of clustering in configuration-model networks is an important respect in which their structure differs significantly from that in most real networks.

IV. EXAMPLES OF DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

A huge number of dynamical systems have been studied in numerous disciplines and from multiple perspectives, and an increasingly large number of these systems have been examined on networks. In this section, we present examples of the most prominent dynamical systems that have been studied on networks. We purposely focus on "simple" situations that are tractable analytically, though studying more complicated systems—typically through direct numerical simulations—is also worthwhile.

Many of the dynamical processes that we consider can of course be studied in much more complicated situations (including in directed networks, weighted networks, temporal networks, [162], and multiplex [109] networks), and many interesting new phenomena occur in these situations. In this article, however, we want to keep network structures as simple as possible. We will discuss ways in which network structure has a nontrivial impact on dynamical processes, but we will have minimal discussion of the aforementioned complications.[196]

A. Percolation

Percolation theory is the study of qualitative changes in connectivity in systems (especially large ones) as its components are occupied or removed [165]. Percolation transitions provide an archetype for continuous transitions, and there has been a lot of work on percolation problems (especially on lattices but increasingly on more general networks) from both physical and mathematical perspectives [108, 138].

1. Site Percolation

The simplest type of percolation problem is *site percolation* (i.e., *node percolation*) [138].

Consider a network and let each of its nodes be either occupied or unoccupied. One can construe occupied nodes as operational nodes in a network, whereas unoccupied nodes are nonfunctional. We might pick nodes uniformly at random and state that they are unoccupied (i.e., are effectively removed from the network) with uniform, independent probability $q = 1 - p \in [0, 1]$; this is a so-called "random attack" with *occupation probability* p. Alternatively, we could be devious and perform some kind of "targeted attack" in which we remove (i.e., set as unoccupied) some fraction of nodes preferentially by degree (which is, by far, the usual case considered), geodesic node betweenness centrality (a measure of how often a node occurs on short paths), or some other network diagnostic. In the limit as the number of nodes $N \to \infty$ in one of these processes, what fraction q_c of the nodes needs to be removed so that we no longer have a connected component—called a *giant connected component (GCC)*—of occupied nodes? A *percolation transition* occurs at the critical occupation probability $p_c = 1 - q_c$, which is the point of appearance/disappearance of a GCC, which is a connected network component that scales in linear proportion to N as $N \to \infty$. (Such scaling is called "extensive" in the language of statistical mechanics [165].)

2. Bond Percolation

In *bond percolation* (i.e., *edge percolation*), we track occupied edges instead of occupied nodes. Edges are labelled as occupied with probability p (uniformly at random), which is called the *bond occupation probability*. As with site percolation, the primary question of interest is the existence and size of a GCC, where connections are made only using occupied edges. If p is below a critical value p_c, then too few edges are occupied to connect the network, and a GCC does not exist. However, above the threshold p_c, the number of nodes in the GCC is a finite fraction of N as $N \to \infty$.

3. K-Core Percolation

The *K-core* of an unweighted, undirected network is the maximal subset of nodes such that each node is connected to at least K other nodes [163]. It is computationally fast to determine K-cores, and they are insightful for many situations [40, 54]. In particular, every unweighted, undirected network has a *k-core decomposition*. Define a network's *K-shell* as the set of all nodes that belong to the K-core but not to the $(K+1)$-core. The network's K-core is therefore given by the union of all c-shells for $c \geq K$, and the network's K-core decomposition is the set of all of its c-shells.

One can examine the K-core of a network as the limit of a dynamical pruning process. Starting with the initial network, delete all nodes with fewer than K neighbors. After this pruning, the degree of some of the remaining nodes will have been reduced, so repeat the pruning step to delete nodes that now have fewer than K remaining neighbors. Iterating this process until no further pruning is possible leaves the K-core of the network.

4. "Explosive" Percolation

In 2009, Ref. [2] suggested the possibility of an "explosive" percolation process in which the transition (as a function of a parameter analogous to the bond occupation probability p) from a disconnected network to a network with a GCC is very steep and could perhaps even be discontinuous. It has now been demonstrated that these family of "explosive" processes, which are often called *Achlioptos processes*, are in fact continuous [42, 189, 190], but the very steep nature of the transitions that they exhibit has nevertheless fascinated many scholars.

Let's consider the simplest type of Achlioptas process. Start with N isolated nodes, and we'll add undirected, unweighted edges one at a time. Choose two possible edges uniformly (and independently) at random from the set of $N(N-1)/2$ possible edges between a pair of distinct nodes. One then adds one of these edges and can choose which one based on a systematic rule that affects the speed of development of a GCC as compared the analogous process in which one only picks a single edge by a random process. One way to obtain "explosive" percolation is to use the so-called "product rule", in which one always retains the edge that minimizes the products of the sizes of the components that it joins (with an arbitrary choice when there is a tie).

Examination of Achlioptas processes on different types of substrate networks and with different choices of rules—especially with the aim of developing rules that do not use global information about a graph—is an active area of research.

5. Other Types of Percolation

There are numerous other types of percolation, and it's worth bringing up a couple of particularly interesting ones. *Bootstrap* percolation is an infection-like process in which nodes become infected if sufficiently many of their neighbors are infected [3]. It is related to the Centola-Macy threshold model for social contagions that we will discuss in Section IV C 1. In *limited path percolation*, one construes "connectivity" as implying that a sufficiently short path still exists after some network components have been removed [121]. (In this example, one can imaging trying to navigate a city but that some streets are blocked.) The percolation of K-cliques (i.e., completely connected subgraphs of K nodes) has been used to study the algorithmic detection of dense sets of nodes known as "communities" [144]. Various percolation processes have also been studied in several different types of multilayer networks [109].

B. Biological Contagions

One of the standard ways to study biological contagions is through what are traditionally called *compartmental models* (though such a term is could be used aptly to describe a much broader set of models), in which the compartments

describe a state (e.g., "susceptible", "infected", or "recovered") and there are parameters that represent transition rates for changing states [18]. The simplest compartmental models are applicable to "well-mixed" populations, in which each individual can meet every other individual with some probability. They can be described using ODEs if one is considering continuous-time state transitions or maps if one is considering discrete-time state transitions. One can add complications by incorporating spatial considerations in the form of diffusion (via a Laplacian operator) or by constructing a metapopulation model, in which different populations ("patches") can have different fractions of entities in different states of an epidemic (or have other differences, such as different transition rates between their component states). In a sense, a metapopulation model provides a simple way of incorporating network information, but one is really thinking of each node as representing some subpopulation of the full population rather than as an individual entity. This distinction is important when one wishes to consider a metapopulation model on a network [35]

The above frameworks assume that one is examining a well-mixed situation, but it is much more realistic in modern society to consider a network of contacts among agents [9, 132, 138]. To do this, one places a compartmental model on a network, so that each node can be in one of several epidemics states (e.g., "susceptible" or "infected"), and the nodes have either continuous or discrete update rules that govern how the states change. These types of models are often called "simple contagions" because of the mechanism of an infection passing directly from one entity to another. This is a reasonable toy model of some biological contagions, though of course real life can be significantly more complicated [91].

1. SI Model

The simplest type of biological epidemic has two states—*susceptible* and *infected*—where healthy nodes are considered "susceptible" because they are not currently infected but can become infected, and "infected" nodes permanently remain in that state. This yields the *susceptible-infected (SI) model*.

The detailed dynamics of SI models can be defined in several different ways. The most common is to consider a stochastic process in which infection is "transmitted" from an infected node to a susceptible neighbor at a rate λ. This is a "hazard rate", and the probability of a transmission event occurring on any chosen edge that connects an infected node to a susceptible in an infinitesimal time interval dt is $\lambda\, dt$. Suppose that we consider a susceptible nodes that has m infected neighbors. The probability of this node becoming infected within the time interval dt is then

$$1 - (1 - \lambda\, dt)^m \to \lambda\, m\, dt \quad \text{as} \quad dt \to 0\,. \tag{1}$$

We therefore say that the *infection rate* for a susceptible node with m infected neighbors is $\lambda\, m$.

2. SIS Model

Let's consider the somewhat more complicated disease-transmission process in which one can become susceptible again after becoming infected. (Alas, permanent recovery is still impossible.) This process is known as the *susceptible-infected-susceptible (SIS) model*.

We must now introduce stochastic rules for the recovery of infected nodes (i.e., the transition from the infected state to the susceptible state). This transition is usually considered to be a spontaneous process that is independent of the states of neighbors. Consequently, each infected node switches to the susceptible state at a constant rate μ. Therefore, in an infinitesimal time interval dt, the probability for a node to switch from the infected state I to the susceptible state S is $\mu\, dt$.

3. SIR Model

Another ubiquitous compartmental model is the susceptible-infected-recovered (SIR) model, in which susceptible nodes can still transition to being infected, but infected nodes recover to a state R in which they can no longer be infected [18]. Fatalistic people might let state R stand for "removed" instead of recovered, but we're going to be more positive than that.

As with the SIS process, two rates define the stochastic dynamics. These are the transmission rate λ and the recovery rate μ. They are both defined as described for SIS above, but now the recovery process takes nodes from the I state to the R state rather than returning them to the S state. Interestingly, the steady-state of the basic SIR model on a network can be related to a bond-percolation process [84]. However, the connection between SIR dynamics and bond percolation is somewhat controversial [90, 107].

4. More Complicated Compartmental Models

The contagion models that we have discussed above are interesting to study, and they provide a nice family of tractable examples (including for some analytical calculations, as we will discuss in Section V) to examine the effects of nontrivial network structure on dynamics. They also provide interesting toy situations for biological epidemics, although they are also grossly unrealistic in just about every situation. Nevertheless, they are very illustrative for our goals, and they have significant potential value in demonstrating effects of network that can also occur in more complicated epidemic models.

One step forward is to do similar investigations of more complicated compartmental models on networks. For example, one can add an "exposed" compartment to obtain an SEIR model, include age structures, and more [18]. One can also study *metapopulation* models on networks [35] to examine both network connectivity and subpopulations with different characteristics.

Another option is to throw analytics out the window, be data-driven, and conduct simulations of incredibly detailed and complicated situations while incorporating parameters that are estimated from real data (as well as doing direct data analysis of epidemics). For example, see Refs. [7, 34, 184]. Ultimately, it is important to make advancements in all of these approaches, because they complement each other.

5. Other Uses of Compartmental Models

A variant set of models involves zombification instead of infections [169], and some of the particular details of the models are occasionally slightly different to reflect this different application. Compartmental models have also been used for various models of social influence [120, 127, 136], though they are not the most common approach to such topics. (See Section IV C for a selection of models that were specifically built to study social influence and related phenomena.)

C. Social Contagions

Ideas spread along social networks in a manner that appears to be somewhat analogous to biological contagions, and the perceived similarity between social and biological epidemics has led to the use of the term "contagion" for the spread of social influence [28]. It is common to discuss ideas being "viral", and some empirical studies have indicated that the spread of ideas in a social network can sometimes be genuinely epidemic-like [192]. Specifically, an epidemic-like (or "simple") contagion refers to cases in which—much like with a virus or a disease—exposure to a single source is enough to initiate propagation. Unlike biological contagions, however, ideas spread in a manner that involves *social reinforcement*: having 100 friends adopt a behavior (or buy a product, join a movement, etc.) can be rather different than if only one friend does so. Because of social reinforcement, social contagions need not just spread discretely (or even discreetly) from one specific source to another. This is why they are sometimes called *complex contagions* [28].

However, discerning whether or not genuine social influence is occurring in a network is extremely challenging. Suppose that one starts from the empirical observation that the actors represented by the network nodes are adopting or newly exhibiting some sort of behavior at different times (e.g., various actors becoming obese, starting to smoke [30, 31, 123], or changing their Facebook profile picture into an equal sign [6, 174]). Such observations can result from one or more of the following effects [166]:

- Genuine spread via social influence, though this could also be social learning (as what might be spreading in the network could simply be awareness or knowledge about something rather than strictly some desire to adopt the behavior). Nevertheless, there is something that is genuinely spreading along the network.
- Homophily: agents tend to want to adopt the same behavior because they have some common traits that lead to such a propensity. That is, there is some sort of internal similarity between agents, but they happen to be adopting the behavior at different times.
- Environment: common external influence on agents. That is, there is some sort of external similarity (or a covariate) that causes agents in a network to adopt the behavior at different times.

Given observations of agents in a network adopting some behavior at different times, an important goal is to distinguish the relative importances of the above effects. This is not easy, and control strategies (e.g., legislation) clearly depend

on whether the cause of the observations is primarily effect (1), (2), (3), or (most likely) some combination of the three of them.

To illustrate this situation, let's consider the obesity contagions that were reported in Ref. [30]. One starts with the observation that people—including several who are related to each other—are becoming fatter (as measured by having a larger body mass index) as a function of time and that increase in BMI over time seems to be propagating through a social network. Such observations could have arisen from social influence (in this case, it seems likely that one can discount social learning), from inherent similarity via similar genetic predispositions or simply similar tastes in food and drink (homophily) but with the effects showing up at somewhat different times, from sources of unhealthy food to which many people in the network had similarly easy access (envrionmental covariates) but again with the effects showing up at different times, or via some combination of the three.

To address such issues, it is important to do a lot of data collection (e.g., through surveys, online resources, and other means) along with data analysis and statistics, and the majority of studies of social influence tend to take such a perspective. However, it is *also* important to develop simple, tractable models of social influence (in which the various effects that resemble putative social influence are, by construction, not confounded with something that genuinely spreads on a network) and to examine their dynamics on networks. Constructing such models yields "simple" dynamical systems on networks. Efforts to construct simple models of social influence date back at least to the 1970s [45, 66, 83], though there has been a rapid acceleration of work on this topic since Watts published his threshold model in 2002 [191].

1. Threshold Models

Let's start by discussing simply threshold models of social influence, which have a very percolation-like flavor (especially bootstrap percolation [3]).

In the 1970s, Granovetter posited a simple threshold model of social influence [83], and Watts later examined a closely related threshold mechanism on unweighted networks early in the last decade [191]. The Watts model has now been studied on weighted networks [100], but for simplicity we will restrict our discussion to unweighted and undirected networks. In the Watts threshold model (and in many other threshold models), each node j has a frozen threshold R_j that is drawn from some distribution. In the Watts model, each node can be in one of two states: 0 (inactive, not adopted, not infected, etc.) or 1 (active, adopted, infected, etc.). Although a binary decision process on a network is a gross oversimplification of social influence, it can already capture two very important features [143]: interdependence (an agent's behavior depends on the behavior of other agents) and heterogeneity (differences in behavior are reflected in the distribution of thresholds). Typically, some seed fraction of nodes ρ_0 are assigned to the active state, although that is not always true (e.g., when some nodes have a negative threshold $R_j < 0$). Depending on the problem under study, one can choose the initially active nodes via some random process (typically, uniformly at random) or with complete malice and forethought. For the latter, for example, one can imagine planting a rumor with specific nodes in a network.

There also needs to be an update rule. For the Watts model, one compares a node's fraction m/k_j of infected neighbors (where m is the number of infected neighbors and k_j is the degree of node j) to the threshold R_j. Node j then becomes infected (i.e., it is in state 1) if $m/k_j \geq R_j$ and otherwise it stays uninfected. The Watts model has a monotonicity property: once a node becomes infected, it remains so forever. As we will discuss in Section V, this feature is particularly helpful when deriving accurate approximations for the model's global behavior. The updates can occur either *synchronously* (i.e., in discrete time, so all nodes are updated at once) or *asynchronously* (i.e., some small fraction of nodes—often just one node—are randomly chosen for update in each time step dt). See Section V D for more detail.

A similar model to the Watts model is the Centola-Macy model [28], in which one considers a node's total number m of active neighbors rather than the fraction of such neighbors. (One then writes $m \geq R_j$, and makes other similar changes, instead of the formulas that we wrote above.) The Centola-Macy rule makes it easier than the Watts update rule for hubs to become active, and this can lead to some qualitative differences in dynamics. It is useful to ponder which of these toy models provides a better caricature for different applications. For posts on Facebook, for example, the number of posts about a topic might make more of a difference than the fraction of one's Facebook friends that have posted about that topic. The special case in which $R = R_j$ for all j in the Centola-Macy model amounts to bootstrap percolation [3].

Scholars have also studied several more complicated threshold models with a similar flavor. For example, one recent interesting threshold model [128] decomposes the motivation for a node to adopt some behavior as a weighted linear combination of three terms: (1) personal preference, (2) an average of the states of each node's neighbors, and (3) a system average, which is a measure of the current social trend. Another study [148] included "syngergistic" effects from nearby neighbors. Another study [130] considered multi-stage complex contagions, in which nodes can be in

one of three states (0: inactive, 1: active, 2: hyper-active) and each node has two thresholds. An inactive node exerts no influence, an active node exerts some influence, and a hyper-active node exerts both regular influence and some bonus influence. (A hyper-active node is necessarily active; thus, state 2 is a subset of state 1, but state 1 is disjoint from state 0.) In such a multi-stage generalization of the Watts model, a node updates its state when its "peer pressure" $P = (l_1 + \beta l_2)/k$ is equal to or exceeds one or more of its thresholds. The number of neighbors in state i is l_i, and β is the bonus influence. (The multi-stage version of the Centola-Macy model has a peer pressure of $P = (l_1 + \beta l_2)$ A node whose peer pressure exceeds or is equal to the first threshold $R_j^{(1)}$ achieves state 1, and a node whose peer pressure exceeds or is equal to the second threshold $R_j^{(2)} \geq R_j^{(1)}$ achieves state 2. Note that this multi-stage complex contagion model is still monotonic. Some studies have considered non-monotic generalizations of the Watts and similar threshold models—e.g., by including "hipster" nodes that become inactive if too many of their neighbors are active [52]. It is also interesting to study interactions between biological and social epidemics [67].

2. Other Models

Although the threshold models of social influence that we described above have the advantage of being mathematically tractable (at least when suitable approximations hold; see Section V) and providing a nice (and convenient) caricature of adoption behavior, they are way too simplistic. For example, these threshold models do not consider specific signals from nodes (e.g., an individual tweeting about the same thing multiple times), which is a "more microscopic" aspect of human behavior. Social reinforcement can arise from multiple friends adopting the same or similar behavior, but it can also arise from the same person sending multiple signals. Moreover, the threshold models are "passive" in the sense that the only signal that ever arises from a node is whether or not it exhibits a behavior (i.e., what state it is in) and all of the dynamics focus entirely on whether a node gets enough influence (purely from what state other nodes are in) to adopt a new behavior. One way to address this is to adopt an idea from neuroscience [62] by supposing that each person is an integrate-and-fire oscillator [151], where the "firing" corresponds to actively sending a signal (e.g., sending a tweet). This can then lead to other nodes adopting the behavior and sending their own signals.

Approaches to modeling social influence and social learning besides threshold models also date back at least to the 1970s, and some of the models that have been studied are also analytically tractable (although they have a rather different flavor). For example, in the DeGroot model [45], individual j has opinion y_j, and the discrete-time opinion dynamics satisfy the equation

$$\mathbf{y}(t+1) = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{y}(t)\,, \qquad t = 0\,, 1\,, 2\,, \ldots\,, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{W}$ is a row-stochastic weight matrix (so that $\sum_j w_{ij} = 1$ for all i), and the matrix element w_{ij} (including the case $i = j$) represents the influence of node j on node i. Noah Friedkin and his coauthors (among others) have generalized the DeGroot model in many ways [66].

There are of course many other models (see, e.g., the discussion in the introduction of Ref. [130]), so our discussion should not be viewed as even remotely exhaustive. See Ref. [16] for additional discussions.

D. Voter Models

Another well-known dynamical system that is often studied on networks is the so-called *voter model* [26]. Voter dynamics were first considered by Clifford and Sudbury [33] in the 1970s as a model for species competition, and the dynamical system that they introduced was dubbed the "voter model" by Holley and Liggett a couple of years later [94].

The basic voter model is defined on a network as follows. Each node has a binary variable that can either be in state $+1$ or in state -1. (For example, the former might represent the US Democratic party, and the latter might represent the US Republican party.) At every discrete time step, one selects some node i uniformly at random, and node i then adopts the opinion s_j of one of its neighbors j (which is selected uniformly at random from among all of its neighbors). If i and j already agreed before the time step, then no change has occurred. One can map this model to a model of random walkers that coalesce when they encounter each other [33, 94]. As discussed in Ref. [26], there are a wealth of studies and results (including mathematically rigorous ones) on the voter model.

The original voter model is of course a gross oversimplification of reality, but it is analytically tractable and provides a foundation for numerous interesting generalizations. Indeed, there are a large number of variants of the original voter model, and many of them provide fodder for wonderfully snarky jokes (e.g., see below). These models also grossly oversimplify reality, but they are interesting, they are sometimes mathematically tractable (depending on the network

structure under consideration), and they can even yield insights that are legitimately interesting for applications. For example, whether consensus is reached and how long it takes to reach consensus (or other equilibrium states) depends on both the specific dynamics and on the network on which those dynamics occur. One nice variant voter model is a "constrained" voter model [187] in which nodes can be in one of three states (Left, Right, and Center). All interactions in this model involve centrists, as extremists refuse to talk to each other. Vázquez et al. studied this mechanism on a square lattice in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and derived probabilities, which depend on the initial conditions, of reaching a consensus in one of the three states or achieving a mixture of the two extremist states. Another interesting variant of the voter model is the "vacillating" (two-state) voter model [113], in which the node i that has been selected examines the states of two of its neighbors, and it changes its state if either of them is different from its own state. (As an example of a snarky joke, one might imagine that this model is more realistic in some countries than in others.) See Ref. [26] for discussions of many more generalizations of the voter model.

E. Kuramoto Phase Oscillators

The *Kuramoto model* [1, 4, 88, 111, 177] is a famous phase-oscillator model and is one of the canonical models in which to study *synchronization* [152, 153], which refers to an adjustment of rhythms of oscillating objects due to their (possibly weak) interactions with each other.

In the Kuramoto model, each node i (where $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$) has an associated phase $\theta_i \in [0, 2\pi)$ whose dynamics are governed by

$$\dot{\theta}_i = \omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^{N} b A_{ij} f_{ij}(\theta_j - \theta_i)\,, \qquad i \in \{1, \dots, N\}\,, \tag{3}$$

where the the natural frequency ω_i of node i is drawn from some distribution $g(\omega)$, the quantity $\mathbf{A} = [A_{ij}]$ is a (binary) network adjacency matrix [197], b_{ij} gives the coupling strength between oscillators i and j, and $f_{ij}(y)$ is some coupling function that depends only on the phase difference between oscillators i and j.

Equation (3) is much more general than the traditional Kuramoto model, for which $f_{ij}(y)$ is the same function $f(y)$ for all node pairs and $f(y) = \sin(y)$. The traditional networks on which to study the Kuramoto model have either all-to-all coupling or nearest-neighbor coupling, but it is both popular and very interesting to examine the Kuramoto model on networks with more general structures. The properties of $g(\omega)$ have a significant effect on the dynamics of equation (3). For example, it is is important whether or not $g(\omega)$ has compact support, whether or not it is symmetric, and whether or not it is unimodal. In traditional studies of the Kuramoto model, $g(\omega)$ is unimodal and symmetric about some mean frequency Ω. The original Kuramoto model also uses all-to-all coupling.

To study the original Kuramoto model, one considers deviations from the mean frequency by transforming to a rotating frame via $\nu_i := \omega_i - \Omega$. One then defines the complex order parameter [4, 177]

$$r(t)e^{i\varphi(t)} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N} e^{i\theta_j(t)}\,, \tag{4}$$

where $r(t) \in [0, 1]$ measures the coherence of the set of oscillators and $\varphi(t)$ gives their mean phase. When $r = 1$, the oscillators are *phase-locked*, which is a form of synchrony in which (as the name implies) the phase differences between each pair of oscillators have the same constant value. In practice, one gets $r \approx 1$ (rather than $r = 1$) for a finite set of oscillators, and the finite-size fluctuations have a size of $O(1/\sqrt{N})$. Additionally, the synchrony properties can be affected in interesting ways by perturbing the Kuramoto model with noise (which can either promote or inhibit synchrony, depending on the precise details) [112].

When placing Kuramoto oscillators on a network, one can then ask the usual question: How does nontrivial network topology (i.e., connectivity) affect the synchronization dynamics of the oscillators [4, 88]? In addition to numerical simulations, one can conduct analytical investigations using generalizations of the order parameter in (4) along with concomitant calculations (see, e.g., [101, 102, 115, 159]) that are more intricate versions of the one used to study the original Kuramoto model [4, 111, 177] .

A particularly interesting study of Kuramoto dynamics on networks was a recent investigation of *explosive synchronization* [81] that was motivated by studies of explosive percolation (see the discussion in Section IV A 4) [2]. Let's consider a mechanism that can lead to an "explosive" (i.e., discontinuous or "first-order") phase transition in a set of interacting Kuramoto oscillators. Consider the Kuramoto dynamics

$$\dot{\theta}_i = \omega_i + b\sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{ij}\sin(\theta_j - \theta_i)\,, \qquad i \in \{1, \dots, N\}\,. \tag{5}$$

On a family of networks (see Ref. [82] for a precise specification) that interpolates between Barabási-Albert (BA) networks in one limit and Erdős-Rényi (ER) networks in the other limit. This family of networks is parametrized by one parameter, which we will denote by α. One obtains a BA network with $\alpha = 0$ and an ER network with $\alpha = 1$. Suppose that the oscillator frequency $\omega_i \propto k_i^\beta$ (where $\beta > 0$) is positively correlated with node degree. Plotting $r(t)$ from equation (4) versus the coupling strength b illustrates a phase transition that appears to become discontinuous in the $\alpha \to 0$ limit. The positive correlation between node degree and the natural frequency of the oscillators appears to lead to a positive feedback mechanism that makes it possible to have a discontinuous phase transition.

To verify that one can truly obtain a discontinuous phase transition (and hence a genuinely "explosive" synchronization transition[198]), let's consider a star graph. In a star network, there is a central hub node that is adjacent to all other nodes, which are each only adjacent to the hub. Suppose that there are $N = K + 1$ nodes, so that the hub has degree K and the K leaf nodes each have degree 1. Denote the natural frequency of the hub oscillator as ω_h, and let each leaf node have a natural frequency of ω.

We enter a rotating reference frame using the transformation $\varphi(t) = \varphi(0) + \Omega t$, where

$$\Omega = \frac{K\omega + \omega_h}{K+1} \tag{6}$$

is (as usual) the mean frequency of the oscillators. We can take $\varphi(0) = 0$ without loss of generality because we can uniformly shift the phases of all oscillators. We thus transform the angular variables as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_h &:= \theta_h - \Omega t\,, \qquad \text{(hub)}\,, \\ \varphi_j &:= \theta_j - \Omega t\,, \qquad j \in \{1, \ldots, K\}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The equations of motion (5) thus become

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\varphi}_h &= (\omega_h - \Omega) + b\sum_{j=1}^{K} \sin(\varphi_j - \varphi_h)\,, \\ \dot{\varphi}_j &= (\omega - \Omega) + \sin(\varphi_h - \varphi_j)\,, \qquad j \in \{1, \ldots, K\}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We thereby obtain

$$\dot{\varphi}_h = (\omega_h - \Omega) + b(K+1)\tilde{r}\sin(\varphi_h)\,, \tag{9}$$

where the second term is a mean-field coupling term and

$$\tilde{r} = \mathrm{Re}(r) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N} \cos\varphi_j \equiv \langle \cos\varphi \rangle\,. \tag{10}$$

(Note that we have expressed the order parameter $\tilde{r}$ in terms of an ensemble average.)

The hub oscillator is phase-locked when $\dot{\varphi}_h = 0$ (i.e., when the relative phases are constant), which occurs when

$$\sin(\varphi_h) = \frac{\omega_h - \Omega}{b(K+1)\tilde{r}}\,. \tag{11}$$

For leaf oscillators to be phase-locked, we need $\dot{\varphi}_j = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. We thus require that

$$\cos\varphi_j = \frac{1}{b}\left\{(\Omega - \omega)\sin\varphi_h \pm \sqrt{\left[1 - \sin^2(\varphi_h)\right]\left[b^2 - (\Omega - \omega)^2\right]}\right\}\,, \qquad j \in \{1, \ldots, K\}\,, \tag{12}$$

which is valid as long as $\Omega - \omega \leq b$. We lose phase-locking at a critical coupling $b = b_c := \Omega - \omega$. For example, if $\omega_h = K$ and $\omega = 1$ (i.e., when each oscillator frequency is equal to the degree of the associated node), we obtain

$$\Omega = \frac{2K}{K+1}\,, \qquad b_c = \frac{K-1}{K+1}\,. \tag{13}$$

The critical value $\tilde{r}_c$ of the order parameter $\tilde{r}$ is then

$$\tilde{r}_c = \left.\frac{\cos\varphi_h + K\cos\varphi_j}{K+1}\right|_{b=b_c} = \frac{K}{K+1} > 0\,. \tag{14}$$

Because $\tilde{r}_c > 0$, we obtain a vertical gap in the phase diagram (i.e., bifurcation diagram) of $\tilde{r}$ versus b. We thereby obtain a discontinuous (i.e., "explosive") phase transition. Kaboom!

F. Other Models

Numerous other dynamical systems have also been studied on networks, and obviously many others can be. In this section, we briefly mention a few of them. As with most of our other discussions, we are not being even remotely exhaustive.

Using general ideas for dynamical systems on networks (see Section V A), one can examine stability for a wealth of both continuous and discrete dynamical systems on networks [68, 146, 147]. For example, such ideas have been applied to investigate synchronization of chaotic systems (such as Rössler circuits [65]) on networks. It is also important to study the control of dynamical systems on networks [36, 46, 137, 160, 164]

A family of examples that is related to some of our previous discussions (see Section IV C 1) are models of financial contagions and systemic risk in banking networks in terms of threshold models of complex contagions but with additional complications [22, 69, 99]. One can reduce the simplest models to threshold models on directed networks, but the incorporation of weighted edges (representing the value of interbank loans) is important for more realistic models. It is also important to incorporate other features of financial contagions.

Clearly, it is also sensible to study models of vehicular (and other) traffic flow on networks [70]. Some of the traditional models of vehicular traffic take the form of nonlinear partial differential equations (PDEs) that possess shock solutions [193], and it is also interesting from an abstract perspective to investigate shock-forming PDEs (such as Burger's equation) and other PDEs on networks [25, 135].

Given the natural network description of neuronal systems, it is crucial to investigate simple models of neural signal propagation on networks [62] in order to illuminate the effects of network structure on dynamics (and, ideally, on functional behavior). Understandably, it is desirable to understand the synchronization properties of such models in networks with different topologies, and some investigations of Kuramoto models on networks have had neuronal applications in mind. It is also important to investigate the effects of delay (e.g., due to propagation along longer neurons) [23, 49]. Neuronal signal models that have been studied on networks include integrate-and-fire models [19], Hindmarsh-Rose oscillators [49], Fitzhugh Nagumo models [23], and so on.

Oscillator synchrony on networks also plays a role in animal behavior, such as in cattle synchrony (e.g., it is supposedly helpful for cattle welfare when cows lie down at the same time) [181]. Moreover, the model for cow behavior in Ref. [181] exhibits an interesting feature that has also recently been noted more generally for dynamical systems on networks [139]: it is possible that increasing the coupling strength of edges or increasing the number of coupling edges can *lower*, rather than raise, the amount of synchrony. The latter case (i.e., reducing synchrony by adding new edges) is a direct analog of the Braess paradox from traffic systems [17, 116].

Predator-prey models on networks have been studied to try to devise control strategies to minimize the size (i.e., number of species involved) in extinction cascades [161]. The study of Boolean networks is also very popular; they have been used for models in subjects such as genetic circuits [29, 106, 154], opinion dynamics [26], and more. Chemical-reaction networks have also been studied for a long time and from many perspectives (see, e.g., [37, 38, 64]).

V. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Now that we have discussed several families of specific models as motivation (and because they are interesting in their own right), we now present some general considerations. We alluded to several of these ideas in our prior discussions.

A. Master Stability Condition and Master Stability Function

In this section, we derive a so-called *master stability condition* and *master stability condition*, which makes it possible to relate the qualitative behavior of a dynamical system on a network to network structure via eigenvalues of the associated adjacency matrix [146]. (One can also of course express such results in terms of eigenvalues of graph-Laplacian matrices.) In our discussion, we closely follow (parts of) the presentation in Newman [138], which presents these ideas in the context of continuous dynamical systems.

Let's suppose that each node i is associated with a single variable x_i. We use $\mathbf{x}$ to denote the vector of variables. Consider the continuous dynamical system

$$\dot{x}_i = f_i(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{ij} g_{ij}(x_i, x_j)\,, \qquad i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\,, \tag{15}$$

where A_{ij} is the network adjacency matrix and $g_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$ gives the effect of network neighbors on each others' dynamics. As usual, the equilibrium points for equation (15) [87, 176] satisfy $x_i = 0$ for all nodes i. To determine the local stability of these points, we (of course) do linear stability analysis: let $x_i = x_i^* + \epsilon_i$ (where $|\epsilon_i| \ll 1$) and take a Taylor expansion. We will assume that the network represented by the adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}$ is static, so one can clearly be much more general than what we do for our presentation. (There are also other ways in which we can be more general.) For each i, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_i = \dot{\epsilon}_i &= f_i(x_i^* + \epsilon_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{ij} g_{ij}(x_i^* + \epsilon_i, x_j + \epsilon_j)\,, \\
&= f_i(x_i^*) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{ij} g_{ij}(x_i^*, x_j^*) + \epsilon_i {f'}_i|_{x_i = x_i^*} + \epsilon_i \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{ij} \left.\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_i}\right|_{x_i = x_i^*, x_j = x_j^*} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \epsilon_j A_{ij} \left.\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_j}\right|_{x_i = x_i^*, x_j = x_j^*} + \dots \\
&= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5 + \dots\,, \qquad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

where $f_i' := \frac{df_i}{dx_i}$ and the α_l terms are defined in order. Because $\mathbf{x}^*$ is an equilibrium, it follows that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 0$. The terms α_3 and α_4 are linear in ϵ_i, and α_5 is linear in ϵ_j. We now neglect all higher-order terms.

To simplify notation, we define

$$\begin{aligned}
a_i &:= \epsilon_i {f'}_i|_{x_i = x_i^*}\,, \\
b_{ij} &:= \left.\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_i}\right|_{x_i = x_i^*, x_j = x_j^*}\,, \\
c_{ij} &:= \left.\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_j}\right|_{x_i = x_i^*, x_j = x_j^*}\,. \qquad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\dot{\epsilon} = \mathbf{M}\epsilon + \dots\,, \qquad (18)$$

where $\mathbf{M} = [M_{ij}]$ and

$$M_{ij} = \delta_{ij} \left[a_i + \sum_k b_{ik} A_{ik} \right] + c_{ij} A_{ij}\,. \qquad (19)$$

Assuming that the matrix $\mathbf{M}$ has N unique eigenvectors (which need not always be the case [87], although it will usually be if we are away from a bifurcation point) and is thus diagonalizable, we obtain

$$\epsilon = \sum_{r=1}^{N} \alpha_r(t) \mathbf{v}_r\,, \qquad (20)$$

where $\mathbf{v}_r$ (with corresponding eigenvalue μ_r) is the rth (right) eigenvector of the matrix $\mathbf{M}$. It follows that

$$\dot{\epsilon} = \sum_{r=1}^{N} \dot{\alpha}_r \mathbf{v}_r = M \sum_{r=1}^{N} \alpha_r(t) \mathbf{v}_r = \sum_{r=1}^{N} \mu_r \alpha_r(t) \mathbf{v}_r\,. \qquad (21)$$

Separately equating the linearly independent terms in equation (21) then yields $\dot{\alpha}_r = \mu_r \alpha_r$, which in turn implies that $\alpha_r(t) = \alpha_r(0) \exp(\mu_r t)$. As usual for dynamical systems [87, 176], we obtain local asymptotic stability if $\mathrm{Re}(\mu_r) < 0$ for all r, instability if any $\mathrm{Re}(\mu_r) > 0$, and a marginal stability (for which one needs to examine nonlinear terms) if any $\mathrm{Re}(\mu_r) = 0$ for some r and none of the eigenvalues have a positive real part.

As an example, let's consider a (significantly) simplified situation in which every node has the same equilibrium location: i.e., $x_i^* = x^*$ for all nodes i. (This arises, for example, in the SI model of a biological contagion.) We will also assume that $f_i \equiv f$ for all nodes and $g_{ij} \equiv g$ for all node pairs. This is also a major simplification, but it is employed in the overwhelming majority of studies in the literature—mostly because it is convenient and because it is still hard to do analytical studies of dynamical systems on networks even with these simplifications. With these simplifications, it follows that

$$f(x^*) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{ij} g(x^*, x^*) = f(x^*) + k_i g(x^*, x^*) = 0\,, \qquad (22)$$

where we recall that k_i is the degree of node i. (Recall that we are considering unweighted and undirected networks.) Equation (22) implies that either all nodes have the same degree (i.e., that our graph "z-regular") or that $g(x^*, x^*) = 0$. We do not wish to restrict the network structure severely, so we will suppose that the latter condition holds. It follows that $f(x^*) = 0$, so the equilibria of the coupled equation (15) in this simplified situation are necessarily the same as the equilibria of the intrinsic dynamics that are satisfied by individual (uncoupled) nodes. This yields a simplified version of the notation from equation (17):

$$\begin{aligned} a_i \equiv a &:= f'|_{x=x^*} \,, \\ b_{ij} \equiv b &:= \left.\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i}\right|_{x_i=x_j=x^*} \,, \\ c_{ij} \equiv c &:= \left.\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_j}\right|_{x_i=x_j=x^*} \,. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

We thus obtain

$$\dot{\epsilon}_i = (a + bk_i)\epsilon_i + c\sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{ij}\epsilon_j \,, \qquad i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}. \tag{24}$$

If we assume that $g(x_i, x_j) = g(x_j)$, which is yet another major simplifying assumption (don't you love how many assumptions we're making?), we obtain

$$\dot{x}_i = f(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{ij} g(x_j) \,. \tag{25}$$

Consequently, $b = 0$ and

$$\dot{\epsilon} = (a\mathbf{I} + c\mathbf{A})\epsilon \,, \tag{26}$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is the $N \times N$ identity matrix.

An equilibrium of (26) is (locally) asymptotically stable if and only if all of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{P} := a\mathbf{I} + c\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}^T$ are negative. (The matrix $\mathbf{P}$ is symmetric, so all of its eigenvalues are guaranteed to be real.) Letting $\mathbf{w}_r$ denote an eigenvector of $\mathbf{A}$ with corresponding eigenvalue λ_r. It follows that

$$(a\mathbf{I} + c\mathbf{A})\mathbf{w}_r = (a + c\lambda_r)\mathbf{w}_r \tag{27}$$

for all r (where there are at most N eigenvectors and there will be exactly N of them if we are able to diagonalize $\mathbf{A}$), so $\mathbf{w}_r$ is *also* an eigenvector of the matrix $\mathbf{P}$, with corresponding eigenvalue $(a + c\lambda_r)$. For (local) asymptotic stability, we thus need $a + c\lambda_r < 0$ to hold for all λ_r. This, in turn, implies that we need $a < 0$ because the adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}$ is guaranteed to have both positive and negative eigenvalues [138]. We thus need (i) $\lambda_r < -a/c$ for $c > 0$ and (ii) $\lambda_r > -a/c$ for $c < 0$. If (i) is satisfied for the most positive eigenvalue λ_1 of $\mathbf{A}$, then it (obviously) must be satisfied for all eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}$. If (ii) is satisfied for the most negative eigenvalue λ_N of $\mathbf{A}$, then it (obviously) must be satisfied for all eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}$. It follows that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_N} < -\frac{c}{a} < \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \,, \tag{28}$$

which is more insightful when we insert the definitions of a and c. This yields

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_N} < -\frac{\left.\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_j}\right|_{x_i=x_j=x^*}}{f'|_{x=x^*}} < \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \,. \tag{29}$$

The left and right terms in equation (29), which is called a *master stability condition*, depend *only* on the structure of the network, and the central term depends *only* on the nature (i.e., functional forms of the individual dynamics and of the coupling terms) of the dynamics. In our opinion, that's really awesome! Less enthusiastically but equally importantly, it also illustrates that the eigenvalues of adjacency matrices have important ramifications for dynamical behavior when studying dynamical systems on networksIndeed, investigations of the spectra (i.e., set of eigenvales) of adjacency matrices can yield crucial insights about dynamical systems on networks [138, 172].

Now let's suppose that each node is associated to more than one variable. We now write

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i = \mathbf{f}_i(\mathbf{x}_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{ij}\mathbf{g}_{ij}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)\,, \qquad i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\,. \tag{30}$$

In other words, the variables and functions are now vector-valued. As before, we do linear stability analysis, and we again derive an equation of the form

$$\dot{\epsilon} = \mathbf{M}\epsilon\,, \tag{31}$$

where ϵ and $\mathbf{M}$ are both $N \times N$ matrices. The matrix component ϵ_{im} denotes the perturbation (in the linear stability analysis) of the mth variable on the ith node. If we assume that the same vector function $\mathbf{f} \equiv \mathbf{f}_i$ describes the intrinsic dynamics on node i and that the coupling function $\mathbf{g} \equiv \mathbf{g}_{ij}$ is the same for all pairs of nodes, then the components $M_{im,jn}$ of the matrix $\mathbf{M}$ [which we index using a double pair of indices (i, m)] are [138]

$$M_{im,jn} = \delta_{ij}a_{mn} + \delta_{ij}k_i b_{mn} + A_{ij}c_{mn}\,, \tag{32}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_{mn} &:= \left.\frac{\partial f_m(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_n}\right|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*}\,, \\ b_{mn} &:= \left.\frac{\partial g_m(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}{\partial u_n}\right|_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{x}^*}\,, \\ c_{mn} &:= \left.\frac{\partial g_m(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}{\partial v_n}\right|_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{x}^*}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

and we are using the dummy variables $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ in (33) to prevent confusion.

Let's now assume once again that $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_j)$. This yields

$$\dot{\epsilon}_{im} = \sum_{jn} \left(\delta_{ij}a_{mn} + A_{ij}c_{mn}\right)\epsilon_{jn}\,. \tag{34}$$

As before, we assume that $\mathbf{M}$ is diagonalizable,

$$\epsilon_{im}(t) = \sum_r \alpha_{rm}(t)v_{ir}\,, \tag{35}$$

and we separately equate the coefficients of the independent eigenvectors $\mathbf{v}_r$ (with corresponding eigenvalues λ_r). The ith component of $\mathbf{v}_r$ is v_{ir}, and the coefficients $\alpha_{rm}(t)$ satisfy the matrix dynamical system

$$\dot{\alpha}_r = \left(\mathbf{a} + \lambda_r\mathbf{c}\right)\alpha_r(t)\,. \tag{36}$$

Define $\sigma(\lambda)$ to be the largest positive real part among the eigenvalues of the matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{M}} := (\mathbf{a} + \lambda\mathbf{c})$. The matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}$ has size $\tilde{N} \times \tilde{N}$, where $\tilde{N}$ is the number of variables associated with each node. For the dynamics to be (locally) asymptotically stable near the equilbrium point $\mathbf{x}^*$, we require that $\sigma(\lambda_r) < 0$ for all r. The function $\sigma(\lambda)$, which is an example of a *master stability function* [146], tends to be easy to evaluate numerically.

In our discussion above, we made numerous simplifying assumptions for expository convenience, but many of them are unnecessary. Without such assumptions, the ensuing equations will look considerably less simple than the ones that we have written, but the simplified forms above already convey the necessary basic ideas. The use of master stability functions and master stability conditions to investigate dynamical systems on networks is widespread and can be very insightful [65, 140, 157, 180]. For example, it has been used to examine the question of whether smaller worlds are easier to synchronize [140] and for numerous other phenomena. There are also versions of MSFs for discrete dynamical systems [65].

B. Other Approaches for Relating Network Structure to Dynamics

There are also other ways to relate network structure to dynamics. In this section, we discuss a few of them very briefly.

As we discussed in Section V A, one can use a master stability function to give sufficient conditions for a system to be stable. Importantly, one can also determine necessary conditions for the stability of a state of a dynamical system. One way to do so is to construct spanning trees of the Coates graph (i.e., the network with the self-edges removed) of the Jacobian matrix near that state [51, 61].

Another way to examine the effects of network architecture on dynamics is through the investigation of *coupled-cell networks* [175]. The structure of a coupled-cell network is a graph that indicates how cells are coupled and which cells are equivalent, and a "multiarrow formalism" [80] allows pairs of nodes to have multiple types of connections between them. This also allows one to examine dynamical systems on multiplex networks [109], and a tensorial formalism and the construction of "quotient networks" [175] can be very helpful for exploring general bifurcation phenomena and robust patterns on coupled-cell networks (see, e.g., [79]).

Isospectral compression, expansion, and other transformations can also be helpful for characterizing dynamical systems on networks [20, 21]

C. Discrete-State Dynamics: Mean-Field Theories, Pair Approximations, and Higher-Order Approximations

To understand the relationship between network structure and local (i.e., node-level) discrete-state dynamics, several approaches to approximating global (i.e., network-scale) observables have been developed. The goal is to accurately predict some emergent characteristics of the dynamics—e.g., the number of nodes that are infected with a disease—given the local (stochastic, discrete-state) dynamics. If an approximation method is amenable to mathematical analysis, it can also be possible to use it to identify bifurcation points or critical parameters that affect the qualitative dynamics. In biological contagion models, for example, it is desirable to estimate the *epidemic threshold* (i.e., the ratio of transmission rate to recovery rate) that, if equaled or exceeded, enables a disease to spread globally through a networked population.

Analytical approximation approaches vary in their complexity, and there is usually an associated trade-off in accuracy (as measured, for example, by comparing the prediction of the theory with a large-scale Monte Carlo simulation of the dynamics). Theories of mean-field (MF) type are most common, as they can provide reasonable—and in some cases, very high—levels of accuracy and are relatively straightforward to formulate.

The main assumptions that underly the derivation of MF theories are as follows [77]:

(1) Absence of local clustering: When the state of node i is being updated, the states of the neighbors of node i are considered to be independent of each other. This will hold, for example, when one makes a *locally tree-like* assumption on the structure of a network. With such a structural assumption, the cycles in a network become negligible as $N \to \infty$, so there are very few pairs of neighbors to consider in the first place.

(2) Absence of modularity: It is usually assumed that the state of every node of given degree k can be described by a single quantity (the mean over the class of degree-k nodes). However, this might not be true if a network has significant modularity, as degree-k nodes can often be located in different communities, and there could also be other sources of diversity among the degree-k nodes. (Note that one can consider analogous situations with structural diagnostics other than degree, though in practice almost all approximations have considered degree.)

(3) Absence of *dynamical correlations*: When updating the state of node i, its own state and the state of its neighbors are assumed to be independent. Such dynamical correlations are rather different from *structural correlations* like degree-degree correlations. Dynamical correlations can have strong effects even in z-regular random graphs, whereas degree-degree correlations play no role in this situation by construction [73].

One can capture dynamical correlations in part by using generalizations of MF theories that incorporate information on the joint distribution of node states at the ends of a random edge in a network. Such theories are often called *pair approximations* (PA) and are more complicated to derive than MF theories [134]. However, they also tend to be more accurate than MF theories. One can also include the dynamics of triplets, quadruplets, and indeed as many nodes as one wants by considering more general *motif expansions* [47, 134, 183].

It is also possible to achieve very accurate approximations by considering compartmental models in which one considers the states of all neighbors when updating a node. Such approaches are expensive computationally, but it has been demonstrated that they can yield high accuracy for models of biological contagions [119, 125]. They have also been successfully generalized for a wide class of binary-state models [74]. Reference [74] also illustrates how to systematically derive PA and MF theories from higher-order compartmental models (see Section V F 2).

Despite the fact that MF assumptions (1)–(3) are violated for many (and perhaps most?) real-world networks, MF theories often give reasonably accurate predictions of global dynamics—at least for well-connected networks and when the dynamical system under consideration is far from any bifurcation points. However, for sparse networks and for

accurate bifurcation analysis, it is desirable to achieve as high a level of accuracy as possible. This motivates a move beyond pair approximations to compartmental models or motif expansions (see Section V E) [13, 47].

The MF theories and its generalizations provide an analytical mechanism to reduce the dimensionality of the system via approximation. Alternatively, one can take a philosophically similar approach (for both dynamics on networks and dynamics of networks) using only computations. See Refs. [14, 158] for examples.

D. Asynchronous Versus Synchronous Updating

When simulating stochastic discrete-state dynamics—such as the binary-state examples that we will discuss in Section V E—on networks, it is necessary to decide on a a method for choosing which nodes to update and when to update them. Some dynamical processes are defined in a way that is simple to simulate numerically. The voter model described in Sec. IV D, for example, is explicitly defined in terms of discrete time steps, and one node is chosen uniformly at random to update in each time step. This is a form of *asynchronous updating*, which goes by that name because individual nodes update independently, such that the new state of a node becomes visible to its neighbors before they attempt to update their own states. One can also employ asynchronous updating for the Watts threshold model described in Sec. IV C 1. One again chooses a node uniformly at random in each time step and—if it is in the inactive state—one compares the fraction of its active neighbors to its threshold to determine if it becomes active. Alternatively, one can choose to update the states of all nodes simultaneously in each time step; this is called *synchronous* (or *parallel*) updating. When updating in this way, nodes change their states based on the states of their neighbors from the previous time step. If one is updating using discrete time steps (as in common in computer simulations), then the synchronous and asynchronous schemes as described above can be considered as limiting cases of a more general update scheme in which a fraction f of the nodes are chosen uniformly at random in each time step for update. If $f = 1/N$, then (on average) one node is updated in each time step, giving the asynchronous methods described above (as used, for example, in voter models). In contrast, the choice $f = 1$ gives synchronous updating. Synchronous updating has the advantage of allowing fast simulations, but asynchronous updating leads to more gradual changes in the aggregate system states. Consequently, asynchronous updating leads—in the limit in which a vanishingly small fraction of the nodes (e.g., $1/N$) are updated in each discrete time step—to dynamics that are accurately described by a set of coupled differential equations. For certain classes of dynamics (e.g., the monotonic dynamics of Section V F), the steady-state (i.e., $t \to \infty$) limits obtained using either synchronous or asynchronous updating schemes are identical, but this need not be true in general. Clearly, the finite-time dynamics are still different even in that case for asynchronous versus synchronous updating.

For stochastic dynamical processes (such as the biological contagion models of Sec. IV B), which are defined in terms of hazard rates, some care is needed in the implementation of an update rule in computational simulations [95]. If a given node i has a rate F_i (i.e., a so-called "hazard rate") for changing states, then it has a probability $F_i\,dt$ of changing its state during an infinitesimal time interval dt. The "infinitesimal" part of this definition is important: it requires that the discrete time step dt of simulations is very small. In practice, dt should be sufficiently small so that only one (or at most a few) nodes are updated in each step. Implementing an update rule in this way ensures that the underlying processes are faithfully reproduced. For example, the length of time T that a node spends in its current state before being updated (assuming that no neighbors are updated during this time) should be exponentially distributed. To see that this is reproduced in simulations, note that in each time step dt, the probability of the node not changing states is $1 - F_i\,dt$. Because there are T/dt discrete time steps in the interval $[0, T]$, the probability that the node survives until time T without changing state is the product of the survival probabilities in each step:

$$\text{Prob(survival until at least } T) = (1 - F_i\,dt)^{\frac{T}{dt}} \ . \tag{37}$$

In the $dt \to 0$ limit, this yields the exponential distribution of survival times (as expected for a Markov process[199], where the probability of changing state depends only on the current state of the system):

$$\lim_{dt\to 0} (1 - F_i\,dt)^{\frac{T}{dt}} = \exp\left(-F_i T\right) \ . \tag{38}$$

One can use the interpretation of stochastic transition rates in terms of survival times to consider alternative asynchronous updating methods, such as Gillespie algorithms [12, 71], which are event-driven rather than using equally-spaced time steps. Although they are less straightforward to code, Gillespie algorithms can considerably accelerate simulation times for certain dynamical processes, and we expect their use for stochastic dynamics (including for non-Markovian dynamics [12]) to become increasingly popular.

E. High-Accuracy Approximations for Binary-State Dynamics

To illustrate some general concepts for how network structure affects dynamics, let's examine a class of *stochastic binary-state dynamics* on configuration-model networks. Recall from Section III that a network in a *configuration-model* ensemble is specified by a degree distribution P_k but is otherwise maximally random [15, 138]: pairs of stubs (i.e., ends of edges) are connected to each other uniformly at random, so there are no correlations in the generative model, and taking the $N \to \infty$ limit guarantees negligible clustering. In this section, we introduce a general class of binary-state dynamics and then examine approximation methods at mean-field, pair-approximation, and higher-order levels [134]. We choose to focus on approximations that yield deterministic ODE systems. Deterministic approximations are valid when the initial seed size of, for example, infected nodes is sufficiently large so that stochastic (i.e., realization-to-realization) fluctuations can be neglected. Otherwise, it is necessary to use methods based on branching processes [78, 141, 142].

1. Stochastic Binary-State Dynamics

In a binary-state dynamical system, each node is in one of two states at any time. For convenience, we will usually refer to these states as *susceptible* and *infected* in our discussion. However, such states could actually mean, for example, "spin up" versus "spin down" magnetic dipoles in an Ising spin model, "inactive" versus "active" nodes in a social system, and so on. Additionally, we will consider asynchronous updating and local rules for node updates; in other words, the transition rates depend only on the state of a node and on the states of its immediate neighbors in the network. Consequently, an updating node that is susceptible becomes infected with probability $F_{k,m}\,dt$, where k is the node's degree and m is the number of its neighbors that are infected. We refer to the function $F_{k,m}$ as the *infection rate*. Similarly, an updating node that is infected becomes susceptible with probability $R_{k,m}\,dt$; we refer to $R_{k,m}$ as the *recovery rate*. (Note that one can also consider functions $F_{k,m}$ and $R_{k,m}$ that depend on network diagnostics other than degree, but we will restrict ourselves to degree.)

It is straightforward to implement these update rules using Monte Carlo simulations. During a small time step dt, a node i of degree k with m infected neighbors is endowed with probability $\pi_i = F_{k,m}\,dt$ (if the node is susceptible) or probability $\pi_i = R_{k,m}\,dt$ (if it is infected) of changing state. By drawing N random numbers r_i from the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$ and comparing the probabilities recorded for each node, the nodes that change states are those nodes i for which $r_i \leq \pi_i$. The time step dt should be small enough so that the number of nodes that change state in a single time step is a small fraction of N (and, as discussed in Sec. V D, it is common to make dt small enough so that this is a single node).

We now consider some examples of binary-state dynamics of the type that we just described. (See Section IV for more examples.) We begin with the classical SIS mode of disease spread. We endow this model with transmission rate λ and recovery rate μ. In a small time interval dt, each susceptible node has probability $\lambda\,dt$ of being infected by each of its infected neighbors. Consequently, the probability that a node with m infected neighbors is not infected by any of them during the time interval is $(1 - \lambda\,dt)^m$. The probability of a susceptible node becoming infected during the time interval dt is then

$$1 - (1 - \lambda\,dt)^m \approx \lambda\,m\,dt \quad \text{as} \quad dt \to 0\,. \tag{39}$$

We thus identify the infection rate for SIS dynamics as

$$F^{\mathrm{SIS}}_{k,m} = \lambda\,m\,. \tag{40}$$

Note that equation (40) is linear in the number m of infected neighbors. In the SIS model, each infected node can recover to the susceptible state at a constant rate μ. This yields

$$R^{\mathrm{SIS}}_{k,m} = \mu\,, \tag{41}$$

which is independent of m.

As another example, consider the standard voter model (see Section IV D). In this example, the labels "susceptible" and "infected" refer to the two opinions. At each time step, one node is chosen uniformly at random for updating (during the interval $dt = 1/N$), and this node copies the state of one of its neighbors (chosen uniformly at random). Therefore, a degree-k node that has m infected neighbors has a probability of m/k of choosing an infected neighbor to copy and a probability of $(k - m)/k$ of copying a susceptible neighbor. This yields

$$F^{\mathrm{Voter}}_{k,m} = m/k \quad \text{and} \quad R^{\mathrm{Voter}}_{k,m} = (k - m)/k\,. \tag{42}$$

One can consider a wide class of well-studied binary-state dynamics within this general framework. Table I in Ref. [74] lists the infection rates $F_{k,m}$ and recovery rates $R_{k,m}$ for models such as the Bass model for innovation diffusion [10, 53], the Ising spin model, the majority-vote model [43, 118], and threshold opinion models.

2. Node-based Approximation for the SI Model

We begin by considering node-based appromimation schemes for the SI model for biological epidemics (see Sec. IV B 1). We closely follow the presentation in Ref. [138]. The simple dynamics allows one to clearly identify the important approximations in this example.

A *node-based approximation* is one in which a variable x_i is defined for every node i in a network. In a given stochastic simulation of the system, x_i takes the value 1 when node i is infected and the value 0 when it is not. If one then considers an ensemble of stochastic simulations, the dynamics evolves differently in each realization, but one can define $\langle x_i \rangle$ as the (time-dependent) mean of x_i over all simulations in the ensemble. To write an equation for the temporal evolution of $\langle x_i \rangle$, first note that if x_i is 0, it can change to 1 only when the disease is transmitted (at a rate λ) from an already-infected neighbor in the network. The ensemble-averaged quantities $\langle x_i \rangle$ therefore obey the following set of differential equations:

$$\frac{d\,\langle x_i \rangle}{dt} = \lambda \sum_j A_{ij}\, \langle (1 - x_i) x_j \rangle \;, \quad i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\,, \tag{43}$$

where A_{ij} is the adjacency matrix (so the sum over j gets nonzero contributions only from neighbors of node i) and the quantity $\langle (1 - x_i) x_j \rangle$ is the probability (over the ensemble of realizations) that node i is susceptible and node j is infected.

The set of equations (43) is large—there is one equation for each node in the network—but a more serious issue is that is not a closed system. To close equations (43), we must either approximate the quantity $\langle (1 - x_i) x_j \rangle$ in terms of the variables $\langle x_i \rangle$ or we need to derive an equation for its temporal evolution. For example, by assuming independence (i.e., no dynamical correlations [77] between the states of nodes i and j, as discussed in MF asumption (3) of Sec. V C), one can write

$$\langle (1 - x_i) x_j \rangle = \langle 1 - x_i \rangle \langle x_j \rangle = (1 - \langle x_i \rangle)\, \langle x_j \rangle\,, \tag{44}$$

which allows one to solve for $\langle x_i \rangle$. We have done a *moment closure* in which we have closed at the first moment to produce a *mean-field theory*.

Alternatively, we can derive

$$\frac{d\langle s_i x_j \rangle}{dt} = -\lambda \langle s_i x_j \rangle + \lambda \sum_{k \neq i} A_{jk} \langle s_i s_j x_k \rangle - \lambda \sum_{l \neq j} A_{il} \langle x_l s_i x_j \rangle\,, \tag{45}$$

where we have written $s_i = 1 - x_i$ for convenience. However, one now has to either approximate the triplet terms (to obtain a so-called *pair approximation* [138], once one also expresses the $\langle s_i s_j \rangle$ and $\langle x_i x_j \rangle$ pair terms in terms of $\langle s_i x_j \rangle$) or derive dynamical equations for the triplet terms. Such equations will include quadruplet terms, of course. Importantly, this discussion has yielded some insight into the moment-closure problems that arise generically for stochastic dynamics on networks. See Ref. [134] for much more detail.

As an explicit example of closing equations (45) to obtain a pair approximation [138], one can use Bayes theorem to derive the approximations

$$\langle s_i s_j x_k \rangle \approx \frac{\langle s_i s_j \rangle \langle s_j x_k \rangle}{\langle s_j \rangle} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle x_l s_i x_j \rangle \approx \frac{\langle x_l s_i \rangle \langle s_i x_j \rangle}{\langle s_i \rangle}\,.$$

One also uses

$$\langle s_i s_j \rangle = \langle s_i (1 - x_j) \rangle = \langle s_i \rangle - \langle s_i x_j \rangle$$

and thereby derive the closed system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\langle s_i x_j \rangle}{dt} &= -\lambda \langle s_i x_j \rangle + \lambda \sum_{k \neq i} A_{jk} \frac{(\langle s_i \rangle - \langle s_i x_j \rangle) \langle s_j x_k \rangle}{\langle s_j \rangle} - \lambda \sum_{l \neq j} A_{il} \frac{\langle x_l s_i \rangle \langle s_i x_j \rangle}{\langle s_i \rangle} \\ &= -\lambda \langle s_i x_j \rangle + \lambda \frac{\langle s_i \rangle - \langle s_i x_j \rangle}{\langle s_j \rangle} \sum_{k \neq i} A_{jk} \langle s_j x_k \rangle - \frac{\lambda}{\langle s_i \rangle} \sum_{l \neq j} A_{il} \langle x_l s_i \rangle \langle s_i x_j \rangle \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

which, along with (43) and $x_i = 1 - s_i$, constitutes a pair approximation.

3. Degree-based Approximation for the SI Model

Dealing with the issue of moment closure requires truncating a hierarchy of differential equations at some stage. Given the complexity of the equations that arise, it is common to reduce the number of equations by assuming that all nodes of degree k behave in a dynamically similar manner [see MF assumption (2) of Sec. V C]. To apply such schemes, which are called *degree-based approximations* in Ref. [138], one is making the assumption that it is reasonable to consider the dynamics (at least as concerns the observables of interest) on a configuration-model network.

Suppose that node i has degree k. We then replace $\langle x_i \rangle$ in equation (43) with a new variable $\rho_k(t)$, which is defined as the fraction of nodes of degree k that are infected at time t. The right-hand side of equation (43), with the MF approximation (44), is

$$\lambda \left(1 - \langle x_i \rangle\right) \sum_j A_{ij} \langle x_j \rangle \ . \tag{47}$$

In the degree-based approximation, we replace $1 - \langle x_i \rangle$ by $1 - \rho_k$, and we replace the sum over neighbors by $k\,\omega$, where

$$\omega(t) = \sum_k \frac{k}{z} P_k \rho_k \tag{48}$$

is the probability that a node at the end of a randomly-chosen edge is infected. Specifically, we choose this edge uniformly at random from all edges of node i, and our use of P_k in equation (48) indicates that we are assuming a configuration-model network. Consequently, the MF degree-based approximation for the SI model is the system of equations

$$\frac{d\rho_k}{dt} = \lambda k (1 - \rho_k)\omega \,. \tag{49}$$

Note that the system (49) contains one equation for each degree class k in the network, and typically this number is much smaller than the number N of nodes, so the dimension of the system (49) is considerably lower than that of (43). To take an extreme example, consider a z-regular network, where every node has exactly z neighbors. In this case, equation (49) reduces to a single equation

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \lambda z (1 - \rho)\rho \tag{50}$$

for the the fraction $\rho(t)$ of infected nodes. This is the well-known logistic differential equation that appears in SI models of homogeneous, well-mixed populations [18].

In the following sections, we will concentrate on degree-based approximations for more general binary-state dynamics, and we will consider a hierarchy of approximation schemes that yield successively better accuracy.

4. Approximation Methods for General Binary-State Dynamics

Reference [74] derived equations for degree-based mean-field (MF) and pair-approximation (PA) theories for general stochastic binary-state dynamics, which are defined in terms of infection and recovery rates $F_{k,m}$ and $R_{k,m}$. The MF equations are

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_k = -\rho_k \sum_{m=0}^{k} R_{k,m} B_{k,m}(\omega) + (1 - \rho_k) \sum_{m=0}^{k} F_{k,m} B_{k,m}(\omega) \,, \tag{51}$$

where $B_{k,m}(\omega)$ denotes the binomial term $\begin{pmatrix} k \\ m \end{pmatrix} \omega^m (1-\omega)^{k-m}$ and we recall that $\rho_k(t)$ is the fraction of nodes of degree k that are infected at time t. We obtain quantity $\omega(t)$ in terms of $\rho_k(t)$ using equation (48). If a network contains non-empty degree classes from $k = 0$ up to some cutoff $k_{\max}$, then equation (51) consists of a closed system of $k_{\max} + 1$ nonlinear differential equations. Standard numerical methods for simulating differential equations enable these equations to be solved efficiently (see Section VI). For example, if we consider the SI model for disease spread, we use $F_{k,m} = \lambda\, m$ and $R_{k,m} = 0$; and using the binomial sum

$$\sum_{m=0}^{k} m\, B_{k,m}(\omega) = k\,\omega \tag{52}$$

yields precisely the MF equations (51) that we derived in equation (49).

One can obtain better accuracy than the MF equations (51) using the PA equations

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\rho_k}{dt} &= -\rho_k \sum_{m=0}^{k} R_{k,m} B_{k,m}(q_k) + (1-\rho_k) \sum_{m=0}^{k} F_{k,m} B_{k,m}(p_k)\,, \\
\frac{dp_k}{dt} &= \sum_{m=0}^{k} \left[p_k - \frac{m}{k}\right] \left[F_{k,m} B_{k,m}(p_k) - \frac{\rho_k}{1-\rho_k} R_{k,m} B_{k,m}(q_k)\right] + \beta^s(1-p_k) - \gamma^s p_k\,, \\
\frac{dq_k}{dt} &= \sum_{m=0}^{k} \left[q_k - \frac{m}{k}\right] \left[R_{k,m} B_{k,m}(q_k) - \frac{1-\rho_k}{\rho_k} F_{k,m} B_{k,m}(p_k)\right] + \beta^i(1-q_k) - \gamma^i q_k
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

for the variables $\rho_k(t)$, $p_k(t)$, and $q_k(t)$. The rates β^s, γ^s, β^i, and γ^i are determined from these variables. For example,

$$\beta^s = \frac{\sum_k P_k(1-\rho_k) \sum_m (k-m) F_{k,m} B_{k,m}(p_k)}{\sum_k P_k(1-\rho_k) k (1-p_k)}\,. \tag{54}$$

See Ref. [74] for details. The quantity $p_k(t)$ [respectively, $q_k(t)$] is the probability that a randomly-chosen neighbor of a susceptible (respectively, infected) degree-k node is infected at time t. (Again, one chooses this neighbor uniformly at random from among all neighbors.) The system of equations (53) consists of $3k_{\max}+1$ differential equations, and it typically gives solutions that are more accurate than the MF equations (51).

Equations (51) and (53) reduce to known MF and PA approximations for well-studied dynamical system on networks. For example, consider the SIS disease model. Inserting $F_{k,m} = \lambda\, m$ and $R_{k,m} = \mu$ from equations (40) and (41) into these general equations yields the MF equations (51) that were derived in Ref. [145] as well as the PA equations from Refs. [60, 117]. Similarly, using the voter-model rates from equation (42) yields the MF equations of Ref. [173]. The PA equations that one obtains in this way [73] constiute a dynamical systems whose dimensionality lies between those of Refs. [156] and [186].

References [73, 74] derived the general MF and PA equations above by considering a more complicated approximation scheme involving what are called *approximate master equations (AME)*. The AME system divides nodes into compartments based both on node state and on the number of infected neighbors. One approximates transitions between compartments by global rates to yield a system of $[(k_{\max}+1)(k_{\max}+2)]$ closed nonlinear differential equations (see Section III of Ref. [74]). One derives PA equations from the AME system by assuming that the number m of infected neighbors of a susceptible (respectively, infected) node is distributed according to the binomial distribution $B_{k,m}(p_k)$ (respectively, $B_{k,m}(q_k)$) and then using this ansatz to derive equations (53) for $p_k(t)$ and $q_k(t)$. This ansatz is exact if the neighbors of a node can be treated as independent of each other. As discussed in MF assumption (1) of Section V C, dynamical correlations imply that this independence-of-neighbors assumption is not true in general, so the AME solutions typically are more accurate than PA solutions, but the latter requires the solution of only $3k_{\max}+1$ equations. The MF equations (51) result from replacing both p_k and q_k by ω—i.e., by neglecting the dependence between the state of the node itself and the states of its neighbor when it is updated [see MF assumption (3) of Section V C]. This yields a system of $k_{\max}+1$ equations.

F. Monotonic Dynamics and Response Functions

For general binary-state dynamics, the AME system is high-dimensional and difficult to analyze. However, in the special case of monotonic threshold dynamics (see Section IV), the AME system reduces to a coupled set of just two ordinary differential equations. This dramatically simplifies analysis. Note that this reduction is exact—i.e., it does not involve any approximation—so the two-dimensional system is more accurate than naive PA or MF theories.

1. Monotonic Threshold Dynamics

Monotonic dynamics allow only one-way transitions, so $R_{k,m} \equiv 0$ for all k and m. Threshold dynamics occur when the transition rate has the form

$$F_{\mathbf{k},m} = \begin{cases} 0\,, & \text{if } m < M_{\mathbf{k}} \\ 1\,, & \text{if } m \geq M_{\mathbf{k}} \end{cases}\,. \tag{55}$$

This reflects deterministic infection (or activation) of a node (once it is chosen for updating) when m is equal to or exceeds the threshold level $M_{\mathbf{k}}$. We have introduced the vector $\mathbf{k}$ to encode two properties of the nodes: their degree k (a scalar) and their type r. (More generally, the type could be a vector $\mathbf{r}$.) Together, these two properties determine the threshold $M_{\mathbf{k}}$ for the nodes in a network. For example, all nodes of type 1 might have the same threshold M_1, and all nodes of type 2 might have a common threshold M_2. Thus, the set of nodes is partitioned into disjoint sets that are labeled by their degree and their type. The type might be some external label for a node (e.g., the dormitory residence of a student in a university Facebook network [185]), the assignment of a node into some community [129], or something else. We combine these labels into a two-vector by writing $\mathbf{k} = (k, r)$ for the $\mathbf{k}$ class of nodes. We generalize the degree distribution to the joint distribution $P_{\mathbf{k}}$, which gives the probability that a node that is chosen uniformly at random has feature vector $\mathbf{k}$ (i.e., it has degree k and is of type r). If the threshold of the nodes are chosen at random using a process that doesn't depend on k (i.e, the thresholds are independent of the node degrees), then one can factor the $P_{\mathbf{k}}$ distribution as $P_{\mathbf{k}} = P_k P_r$, where P_k is the degree distribution and P_r is the probability that a node is of type r. By taking a large set of discrete types, it is possible to approximate a continuous distribution of thresholds (e.g., a Gaussian distribution) to a desired level of accuracy. Reference [74] demonstrated that the AME system reduces exactly to the pair of ordinary differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho}{dt} &= h(\phi) - \rho \\ \frac{d\phi}{dt} &= g(\phi) - \phi \,, \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where

$$h(\phi) = \rho(0) + (1 - \rho(0)) \sum_{\mathbf{k}} P_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{m \geq M_{\mathbf{k}}} B_{k,m}(\phi) \tag{57}$$

and

$$g(\phi) = \rho(0) + (1 - \rho(0)) \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{k}{z} P_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{m \geq M_{\mathbf{k}}} B_{k-1,m}(\phi) \,. \tag{58}$$

The variable $\phi(t)$ is the probability that a node at one end of an edge that is chosen uniformly at random is infected, conditional on the node at the other end of the edge being susceptible [72]. The initial conditions for (56) are

$$\phi(0) = \rho(0) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} P_{\mathbf{k}} \rho_{\mathbf{k}}(0) \,. \tag{59}$$

Solving (56) with the initial conditions (59) yields the fraction $\rho(t)$ of infected nodes in a network at time t to a very high level of accuracy. See Fig. 1 for an example.

2. Response Functions for Monotonic Binary Dynamics

Although Ref. [74] derived equations (56) from a full AME system, they can also be obtained using other approaches. Reference [72], for example, derived equations (46) as the asynchronous limit of corresponding synchronous-updating equations that were determined by using methods from the study of zero-temperature random-field Ising models [50, 76]. These methods are related to belief-propagation and message-passing algorithms [131], and the approach of Ref. [72] makes it possible to generalize beyond the (uncorrelated) configuration-model networks that we have considered thus far. Low-dimensional descriptions such as (56) for monotonic threshold dynamics have been derived for

- networks with degree-degree correlations and/or community structure [72, 129];
- networks with non-negligible clustering [89];
- and multiplex networks [194].

In Ref. [72], it was also demonstrated that several structural characteristics of networks, such as giant connected component (GCC) sizes for site and bond percolation and sizes of K-cores [54], can be expressed as steady states of monotonic threshold dynamics. They can thereby be determined using equations of the form (56). This perspective



FIG. 1: Fraction $\rho(t)$ of infected nodes in a threshold model (equation (55)) on a 5-regular random graph (i.e., $P_k = \delta_{k,5}$). We let all nodes having the same threshold level $M_5 = 2$, and the initial fraction of infected nodes is $\rho(0) \approx 0.055$. The numerical simulation results (see Section VI) are for a network with $N = 10^5$ nodes and use a time step of $dt = 10^{-5}$. The symbols give means over 24 realizations; the error bars indicate one standard deviation above and below the mean. Note that the AME solution is identical to the solution of the two-dimensional system (56).

is likely to be particularly fruitful in the extension of traditional network measures to multiplex and other multilayer networks [27, 109, 194].

As an example, we show how one can apply equations (56) to the Watts threshold model for social influence that we described in Section IV C 1. Recall that each node has a (frozen) threshold r_i that is drawn from some distribution, and a node i that is being updated becomes active (i.e., moves to the "infected" state) if its fraction of active neighbors $m_i/k_i \geq r_i$. The thresholds r_i are distributed independently of node degrees, so $P_{\mathbf{k}} = P_k P_r$. Equation (55) for this model is

$$F_{\mathbf{k},m} = \begin{cases} 0\,, & \text{if } m < kr \\ 1\,, & \text{if } m \geq kr \end{cases}\,, \tag{60}$$

and the sums over types in equation (57) become

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}} P_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{m \geq M_{\mathbf{k}}} B_{k,m}(\phi) = \sum_r P_r \sum_{m \geq kr} B_{k,m}(\phi) \tag{61}$$

$$= \sum_{m=0}^{k} B_{k,m}(\phi) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_r H\left[m - kr\right]\, dr \tag{62}$$

$$= \sum_{m=0}^{k} B_{k,m}(\phi) \int_{\frac{m}{k}}^{\infty} P_r\, dr \tag{63}$$

$$= \sum_{m=0}^{k} B_{k,m}(\phi) C\left(\frac{m}{k}\right)\,, \tag{64}$$

where H denotes the Heaviside function and C is the cumulative distribution function (cdf) of the thresholds.

Reference [72] showed that the $C(m/k)$ term in equation (61) is an example of a *response function* for monotonic dynamics, which we will take to be a function $f(k,m)$ that depends on the degree k of a node and the number m of infected neighbors. (More generally, a response function can also depend on other network characteristics.) The response function encapsulates the mechanism by which a susceptible node becomes infected when it is updated. Equations (57,58) then take the form

$$h(\phi) = \rho(0) + (1 - \rho(0)) \sum_k P_k \sum_{m=0}^{k} B_{k,m}(\phi) f(k,m) \tag{65}$$

and

$$g(\phi) = \rho(0) + (1 - \rho(0)) \sum_k \frac{k}{z} P_k \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} B_{k-1,m}(\phi) f(k,m) \,. \tag{66}$$

Response functions of this type have also been defined for other monotonic threshold models (such as many of the complex-contagion models in Section IV) and related problems. In bond percolation, for example, the equations for the fractional size of the GCC (i.e., the epidemic size in an SIR model), which was previously derived using generating-function methods [24], are reproduced using $\rho(0) = 0$, the response function

$$f(k,m) = \begin{cases} 0\,, & \text{if } m = 0 \\ 1 - (1-p)^m\,, & \text{if } m > 0 \end{cases} , \tag{67}$$

and by applying the identity

$$\sum_{m=1}^{k} B_{k,m}(\phi) \left[1 - (1-p)^m\right] = 1 - (1 - p\phi)^k \,. \tag{68}$$

See Section II.B of [72] for additional discussion.

3. Cascade Conditions

In addition to giving very accurate predictions for monotonic dynamics, equations (56) make it possible to obtain analytical insights into dynamical processes. Let's again take the Watts threshold model as an example. Consider the question of whether, for a given distribution of thresholds, global cascades can occur on configuration-model networks with degree distribution P_k. Watts used percolation theory in [191] to derive a *cascade condition* that addresses this question. We will now derive the same cascade condition by using linear stability analysis of the two-dimensional dynamical system defined by equations (56,65,66).

Suppose that all nodes have positive thresholds, so $C(0) = 0$, and consider the seed fraction $\rho(0)$ to be vanishingly small. The system (56) then has an equilibrium point at $(\rho, \phi) = (0, 0)$ that corresponds to a complete absence of infection. However, if this equilibrium point is (linearly) unstable, then a small perturbation (e.g., the infection of a single node) can move the dynamical system away from the equilibrium at $(0, 0)$ and result in values $\rho(t) > 0$, constituting a global cascade. By the term "global", we mean that a non-vanishing fraction of the nodes in the network become infected in the $N \to \infty$ limit of infinite network size [200].

The stability of system (56) is controlled by the second equation $\frac{d\phi}{dt} = g(\phi) - \phi$: when this one-dimensional (1D) dynamical system is unstable at $\phi = 0$, the values of ρ determined from the first equation of (56) are also strictly positive. One uses standard linear stability analysis [56, 176] to show that (local) instability occurs at $\phi = 0$ if and only if the following condition holds:

$$\frac{d}{d\phi} \left[g(\phi) - \phi\right]\Big|_{\phi=0} > 0 \,. \tag{69}$$

That is, there is a local instability when $g'(0) > 1$, and the monotonic nature of the dynamics guarantees that in this case the $\rho(t)$ variable is strictly positive for all time, i.e., that a global cascade occurs. We now differentiate equation (66), which is the general response-function form of g, using $f(k,m) = C(m/k)$ for the Watts model and incorporate the facts that $B_{k,m}(0) = \delta_{m,0}$ and $f(k,0) = 0$ to obtain the cascade condition found in [191]:

$$\sum_k \frac{k}{z}(k-1) P_k f(k,1) > 1 \,. \tag{70}$$

When (70) is satisfied, global cascades can occur in the Watts model. Note that this general condition incorporates information about both network topology (via the degree distribution P_k) and node-level dynamics (through the expected response $f(k,1)$ of a degree-k node to a single infected neighbor), thereby yielding interesting and useful information on how network topology influences dynamics.

G. Additional Considerations

As discussed in Section V E, there exist rather sophisticated approximation methods for binary-state dynamics on configuration-model networks. Moreover, for monotonic binary dynamics, there has also been significant progress in extending theories to networks with degree-degree correlations, clustering, modularity, and multilayer structures (see Section V F 2). Indeed, degree-degree correlations have been incorporated into many MF and PA methods, giving approaches that are sometimes called *heterogeneous-MF* and *heterogeneous-PA* theories.

However, despite this progress, much remains to be done. Moving beyond binary-state dynamics is a significant challenge. There has been notable progress in some dynamical systems that include three states—particularly when the dynamics remains monotonic (i.e., transitions between states still occur only in one direction). Examples include the multi-stage complex contagion model of social influence in Ref. [130] and high-accuracy approximations for SIR disease spread [119, 133]. It would be very interesting—though also rather challenging—to extend the compartmental AME approach to dynamics with more than two states and to subsequently use the results of such analysis to derive PA and MF approximations like (51) and (53) in a systematic fashion. Other open problems include developing high-accuracy approximations of nodal dynamics with a continuum of states—e.g., with differential equations at each node, as in the Kuramoto oscillator model [101]—and understanding the novel features observed in non-monotonic binary dynamics with synchronous updates in [52].

VI. SOFTWARE IMPLEMENTATION

In this section, we briefly discuss practical issues for simulating dynamical systems on networks.

A. Stochastic Simulations (Monte Carlo Simulation)

As noted in Section V E 1, it is straightforward to implement a Monte Carlo simulation of stochastic binary-state dynamics. The special case of monotonic threshold dynamics is especially simple, so we describe it briefly in the context of the Watts model. (See Ref. [95] for discussions of fast algorithms for epidemic models on networks.)

Given an adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}$ and an $N \times 1$ vector $\mathbf{v}$ that stores the states of each node (at a given time, $v_i = 0$ if node i is susceptible and $v_i = 1$ if node i is infected), one calculates the number of infected neighbors m_i of node i using matrix multiplication:

$$\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}\,. \tag{71}$$

Similarly, the degree k_i of each node i is the ith element of the vector $\mathbf{k}$ defined by

$$\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{1}\,, \tag{72}$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ represents the $N \times 1$ vector $(1, 1, 1, \ldots, 1)^T$. At each time step in an asynchronous updating scheme (see Section V D), a node i is chosen uniformly at random for updating, and v_i is set to 1 if m_i/k_i exceeds or is equal to the threshold r_i of node i. The updated state vector $\mathbf{v}$ is then used to calculate the updated $\mathbf{m}$ vector from equation (71), and the simulation continues to the next time step. One can terminate the temporal evolution when the condition

$$\frac{m_i}{k_i} < r_i \quad \text{for all nodes} \quad i \quad \text{with} \quad v_i = 0 \tag{73}$$

is satisfied, as this implies that no further susceptible nodes can be infected and the system has reached a steady state. One can show [75] that the steady state of monotonic threshold dynamics is independent of whether one employs asynchronous or synchronous updating, so one can accelerate the algorithm described above by updating all nodes simultaneously in each time step if one is interested only in the steady state. (Naturally, it is often the case that one wishes to explore phenomena besides a steady state [130].)

B. Differential Equation Solvers for Theories

Octave/Matlab codes for implementing and solving the systems of ordinary differential equations that arise from various approximation schemes for stochastic binary-state dynamics are available at `www.ul.ie/gleesonj/solve_AME`.

In these codes, a user specifies as inputs the degree distribution P_k of a network, the infection rate $F_{k,m}$ and recovery rate $R_{k,m}$ of the dynamics, and the initial fraction $\rho(0)$ of infected nodes. The code then automatically implements

the AME equations, the PA equations (53), and the MF equations (51) as systems of ordinary differential equations and then solves them using standard numerical techniques. Results are output as plots that show the infected fraction $\rho(t)$ of nodes and the fraction of edges that connect susceptible nodes to infected nodes as function of time.

Additionally, Gerd Zschaler and Thilo Gross have posted software [195] for simulating dynamical systems on time-dependent networks at `http://www.biond.org/node/352`. See Section VII for a brief discussion of such systems.

VII. DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS ON DYNAMICAL NETWORKS

The study of dynamical systems on time-dependent networks has become extremely popular recently, but there are also much older quantitative studies of such phenomena. For example, Farmer et al. [63] and Bagley et al. [5] used such a framework more than two decades ago in studies of chemical reactions.

Our discussion in prior sections focused on dynamics that occur on static networks. In this case, one is assuming that network structure does not change on the time scale of the nodal dynamics or at least that it changes so little that it is permissible to pretend that it is static. However, there are many situations in which a network itself can be dynamic, with edges (or edge weights) and/or nodes changing in time, perhaps in response to a dynamical system running on the nodes. In general, three basic situations are possible [149]:

- A dynamical system on a network runs on a much faster time scale than the dynamics of the network itself. In this case, it is reasonable (at least to a first approximation) to assume that a network is static.
- The dynamics of a network are much faster than the dynamical system that one is examining on that network. In this case, it is reasonable (at least to a first approximation) to assume that the states of the network nodes are fixed (e.g., a "susceptible" node will not change to being "infected") and to consider only the dynamics of the underlying network. (Given the interest in and importance of multilayer networks [109], one can also make a similar comment about states of edges.)
- The dynamics on a network and the dynamics of the network itself operate on comparable time scales, so it is not reasonable to ignore either of them. Such networks are sometimes called "adaptive networks" [85, 162].

The dynamics of networks can have a profound impact on dynamical systems on networks [11, 92, 93, 97, 98, 103, 104, 126, 149, 150, 168, 182]. The burstiness (and, more generally, non-Poissonian) nature of interactions in temporal networks affects not only the effective weights of static interactions derived from averaging over such interactions but also the behavioral of dynamical processes on time-dependent networks versus those on static networks obtained from averaging [12, 92, 93, 149].

A good example of a dynamical system on a time-dependent (or "temporal" [97, 98]) network is an adaptive SIS model [86], in which a susceptible node can break any edge it has to an infected node and rewire to a randomly-chosen susceptible node. Compartmental approaches of the AME type have been applied successfully to this model [125], and they agree very well with the results of numerical simulation. Similar approaches were also used to study a two-opinion adaptive voter model in Ref. [59], which built on the model in [96]. (This model was generalized to $n > 2$ opinions in [167] and to include mechanisms that reinforced local clustering in Ref. [124].) In Ref. [59], an edge of a network is chosen uniformly at random at each time step. If the opinions of the nodes at each end of the edge are different, then one end-node imitates the opinion of the other with probability $1-\alpha$. However, with probability α, the edge is broken and one node instead makes a new connection to another node (chosen, depending on the variant of the model, either at random from the whole network, or from those who hold the same opinion as the node). On a finite network, such adaptive voter dynamics eventually yield a steady state in which a network can contain disconnected components, where each component contains only nodes who share the same opinion. Adaptive voter dynamics has proven a particularly challenging test for approximation methods. The review [47] carefully examined such a model and concluded that none of the approximation schemes that have been developed are able to give fully satisfactory results in all regions of parameter space.

A nice way to examine dynamical systems on temporal networks is using so-called *activity-driven networks* [150]. One constructs an "activity potential" for each agent in such a network to encapsulate the number of interactions that he/she performs in a characteristic time window. One thereby attempts to characterize interactions between agents, and activity rates can come either from specified functions or from empirical data. Using the activity potentials (which can be different for different agents), one can construct an instantaneous temporal description of network dynamics. This approach has led to insights on phenomena such as the emergence of strong ties in temporal communication networks [105] and how to control contagions in temporal networks [120].

It can also be useful and interesting take a statistical perspective on dynamical systems on temporal networks (see, e.g., [170, 171]). For example, one can use a time-dependent generalization of exponential random graph models (ERGMs) [122] and thereby study a temporal ERGM (TERGM) [48].

When studying dynamical systems on time-dependent networks, there is a lively debate about whether dynamics of networks slow down dynamical processes or speed them up [97, 98, 103, 104, 126, 182] (and, naturally, the answer is different for different dynamical systems), and it is desirable to examine such effects on a broad variety of dynamical systems. For example, bursty communication patterns can either speed up or slow down adoption speed in threshold models, and temporal-network generalizations of the Watts (i.e., fractional threshold) and Centola-Macy (i.e., absolute threshold) complex contagion models exhibit interesting differences [103, 182].

VIII. CONCLUSION, OUTLOOK, AND OPEN PROBLEMS

In this paper, we have given a tutorial for studying dynamical systems on networks. By reading this paper, you should now have a reasonable understanding of (1) why it is interesting and desirable to study dynamical systems on networks; (2) several of the popular families of problems and models; (3) basic considerations about dynamical systems on networks; (4) the use and range of validity of techniques for analytical approximatin such as mean-field theories, pair approximations, and higher-order motif expansions; (5) software implementation of both direct numerical simulations and for simulating equations that result from the aforementioned approximation methods; and (6) time-scale issues and challenges for investigating dynamical systems on time-dependent networks. As this paper is a tutorial rather than a literature review, there is a lot that we haven't covered, and we strongly encourage you to scour the literature for interesting problems to study and generalize. The primary purpose of this paper is to equip you with the background knowledge to be able to do so successfully.

Before saying "goodbye," it is also worth commenting on some of the particularly challenging problems that are available. For example, although one can study problems by purely computational means, it is desirable (when possible) to try to develop analytical techniques in order to gain insights on these problems. Mathematically rigorous results tend to be rare—see, e.g., [57, 58]—but approximations and heuristic techniques have been employed on many toy problems. A key goal is to find the "next easiest" sets of dynamical systems on networks to study using more general versions of these techniques and to use them to help develop these methods further. Many of the systems that have been investigated in the literature are either some kind of percolation or fairly (or even very) closely related to percolation, and it is important to move beyond that.

There are many open issues in the study of dynamical systems on time-dependent networks. One needs to examine the balance of time scales for dynamics on networks versus the dynamics of the networks themselves [149], and the effects that this has on the validity and choices of analytical techniques to use is also very important. Most of the studied situations with both dynamics on networks and dynamics of networks tend to be unrealistic, so this is an area that is particularly ripe for further study.

Finally, many networks are *multiplex* (i.e., include multiple types of ties) or have other *multilayer* features [109]. The existence of multiple layers over which dynamics can occur and the possibility of both structural and dynamical correlations between layers offers another rich set of opportunities to study dynamical systems on networks. The investigation of dynamical systems on multilayer networks is only in its infancy, and this area is also loaded with rich set of problems.

Goodbye.

Acknowledgements

Both authors are supported by the European Commission FET-Proactive project PLEXMATH (Grant No. 317614). MAP also acknowledges a grant (EP/J001759/1) from the EPSRC, and JPG acknowledges funding from Science Foundation Ireland (Grants No. 11/PI/1026 and 09/SRC/E1780). We acknowledge the SFI/HEA Irish Centre for High-End Computing (ICHEC) for the provision of computational facilities. We thank Vittoria Colizza, Marty Golubitsky, Vincent Jansen, Zoe Kelly, and Bernadette Stolz for helpful comments.

[1] J. A. Acebrón, L. L. Bonilla, V. Pérez, F. Ritort, and R. Spigler. The Kuramoto model: A simple paradigm for synchronization phenomena. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 77:137–185, 2005.

[2] D. Achlioptas, R. M. D'Souza, and J. Spencer. Explosive percolation in random networks. *Science*, 323(5920):1453–1455, 2009.

[3] M. Aizenman and K. Lebowitz. Metastability effects in bootstrap percolation. *Journal of Physics A*, 21:3801–3813, 1988.

[4] A. Arenas, A. Díaz-Guilera, J. Kurths, Y. Moreno, and C. Zhou. Synchronization in complex networks. *Physics Reports*, 469:93–153, 2008.

[5] R. J. Bagley, J. D. Farmer, S. A. Kauffman, N. H. Packard, A. S. Perelson, and I. M. Stadnyk. Modeling adaptive biological systems. *Biosystems*, 23(2–3):113–137, 1989.

[6] E. Bakshy. Showing support for marriage equality on Facebook. `https://www.facebook.com/notes/facebook-data-science/showing` 2013.

[7] D. Balcan, H. Hu, B. Goncalves, P. Bajardi, C. Poletto, J. Ramasco, D. Paolotti, N. Perra, M. Tizzoni, W. Van den Broeck, V. Colizza, and A. Vespignani. Seasonal transmission potential and activity peaks of the new influenza A/H1N1: A Monte Carlo likelihood analysis based on human mobility. *BMC Medicine*, 7:45, 2009.

[8] A. L. Barabási and R. Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999.

[9] A. Barrat, M. Barthelemy, and A. Vespignani. *Dynamical Processes on Complex Networks*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

[10] F. M. Bass. A new product growth for model consumer durables. *Management Science*, 15(5):215–227, 1969.

[11] I. V. Belykh, V. N. Belykh, and M. Hasler. Blinking model and synchronization in small-world networks with a time-varying coupling. *Physica D*, 195:188–206, 2004.

[12] M. Boguña and M. Ángeles Serrano. Simulating non-Markovian stochastic processes. arXiv:1310.0926, 2013.

[13] G. A. Böhme and T. Gross. Analytical calculation of fragmentation transitions in adaptive networks. *Physical Review E*, 83(3):35101, 2011.

[14] K. A. Bold, K. Rajendran, B. Ráth, and I. G. Kevrekidis. An equation-free approach to coarse-graining the dynamics of networks. arXiv:1202.5618, 2012.

[15] B. Bollobás. *Modern Graph Theory*. Springer Verlag, 1998.

[16] J. Borge-Holthoefer, R. A. B. nos, S. González-Bailón, and Y. Moreno. Cascading behavior in complex socio-technical networks. *Journal of Complex Networks*, 1:3–24, 2013.

[17] D. Braess. Über ein paradoxon aus der verkehrsplanung. *Unternehmensforschung*, 12:258–268, 1969.

[18] F. Brauer and C. Castillo-Chavez. *Mathematical Models in Population Biology and Epidemiology*. Springer Verlag, 2nd edition, 2012.

[19] N. Brunel and V. Hakim. Fast global oscillations in networks of integrate-and-fire neurons with low firing rates. *Neural Computation*, 11:1621–1671, 2002.

[20] L. A. Bunimovich and B. Z. Webb. Isospectral compression and other useful isospectral transformations of dynamical networks. *Chaos*, 22:033118, 2012.

[21] L. A. Bunimovich and B. Z. Webb. Isospectral graph transformations, spectral equivalence, and global stability of dynamical networks. *Nonlinearity*, 25(1):211–254, 2012.

[22] F. Caccioli, M. Shrestha, C. Moore, and J. D. Farmer. Stability analysis of financial contagion due to overlapping portfolios. arXiv:1210.7233, 2012.

[23] C. Cakan, J. Lehnert, and E. Schöll. Heterogeneous delays in neural networks. arXiv:1311.1919, 2013.

[24] D. S. Callaway, M. E. Newman, S. H. Strogatz, and D. J. Watts. Network robustness and fragility: Percolation on random graphs. *Physical Review Letters*, 85(25):5468, 2000.

[25] J.-G. Caputo and D. Dutykh. Nonlinear waves in networks: A simple approach using the sine–Gordon equation. arXiv:1402.6446, 2014.

[26] C. Castellano, S. Fortunato, and V. Loreto. Statistical physics of social dynamics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 81:591–646, May 2009.

[27] D. Cellai, E. López, J. Zhou, J. P. Gleeson, and G. Bianconi. Percolation in multiplex networks with overlap. *Physical Review E*, 88:052811, 2013.

[28] D. Centola and M. Macy. Complex contagions and the weakness of long ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(3):702–734, 2007.

[29] M. Chaves, E. D. Sontag, and R. Albert. Robustness and fragility of Boolean models for genetic regulatory networks. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 235:431–449, 2005.

[30] N. A. Christakis and J. H. Fowler. The Spread of Obesity in a Large Social Network over 32 Years. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 357(4):370–379, July 2007.

[31] N. A. Christakis and J. H. Fowler. Social contagion theory: Examining dynamic social networks and human behavior. *Statistics in Medicine*, 32(4):556–577, 2013.

[32] A. Clauset, C. R. Shalizi, and M. E. J. Newman. Power-law distributions in empirical data. *SIAM Review*, 51:661–703, 2009.

[33] P. Clifford and A. Sudbury. A model for spatial conflict. *Biometrika*, 60(3):581–588, 1973.

[34] V. Colizza, A. Barrat, M. Barthelemy, A.-J. Valleron, and A. Vespignani. Modeling the world-wide spread of pandemic influenza: baseline case and containment interventions. *PLoS Medicine*, 4:e13, 2007.

[35] V. Colizza, R. Pastor-Satorras, and A. Vespignani. Reaction-diffusion processes and metapopulation models in heterogeneous networks. *Nature Physics*, 3:276–282, 2007.

[36] N. J. Cowan, E. J. Chastain, D. A. Vilhena, J. S. Freudenberg, and C. T. Bergstrom. Nodal dynamics, not degree distributions, determine the structural controllability of complex networks. *PLoS One*, 7(6):e38398, 2012.

[37] G. Craciun and M. Feinberg. Multiple equilibria in complex chemical reaction networks. I. the injectivity property. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 65:1526–1546, 2005.

[38] G. Craciun and M. Feinberg. Multiple equilibria in complex chemical reaction networks. II. The species-reaction graph. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 66:1321–1338, 2006.

[39] M. C. Cross and P. C. Hohenberg. Pattern formation outside equilibrium. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 65(3):851–1112, July 1993.

[40] P. Csermely, A. London, L.-Y. Wu, and B. Uzzi. Structure and dynamics of core-periphery networks. *Journal of Complex Networks*, 1(2):93–123, 2013.

[41] P. Cvitanović, R. Artuso, R. Mainieri, G. Tanner, G. Vattay, N. Whelan, and A. Wirzba. *Chaos: Classical and Quantum*. 2012. Version 14, available at `chaosbook.org`.

[42] R. A. da Costa, S. N. Dorogovstev, A. V. Goltsev, and J. F. F. Mendes. Explosive percolation transition is actually continuous. *Physical Review Letters*, 105:255701, 2010.

[43] M. J. de Oliveira. Isotropic majority-vote model on a square lattice. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 66(1-2):273–281, 1992.

[44] D. J. de Solla Price. A general theory of bibliometric and other cumulative advantage processes. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 27:292–306, 1976.

[45] M. H. DeGroot. Reaching consensus. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 69(345):118–121, 1974.

[46] P. DeLellis, M. di Bernardo, T. E. Gorochowski, and G. Russo. Synchronization and control of complex networks via contraction, adaptation and evolution. *Circuits and Systems Magazine, IEEE*, 10(3):64–82, thirdquarter 2010.

[47] G. Demirel, F. Vazquez, G. A. Bhöme, and T. Gross. Moment-closure approximations for discrete adaptive networks. *Physica D*, 267:68–80, 2014.

[48] B. Desmarais and S. Cranmer. Statistical mechanics of networks: Estimation and uncertainty. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 391(4):1865–1876, 2012.

[49] M. Dhamala, V. K. Jirsa, and M. Ding. Enhancement of neural synchrony by time delay. *Physical Review Letters*, 92:074104, 2004.

[50] D. Dhar, P. Shukla, and J. P. Sethna. Zero-temperature hysteresis in the random-field Ising model on a Bethe lattice. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 30(15):5259, 1997.

[51] A.-L. Do, S. Boccaletti, and T. Gross. Graphical notation reveals topological stability criteria for collective dynamics in complex networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 108:194102, 2012.

[52] P. S. Dodds, K. D. Harris, and C. M. Danforth. Limited imitation contagion on random networks: Chaos, universality, and unpredictability. *Physical Review Letters*, 110(15):158701, 2013.

[53] P. S. Dodds and D. J. Watts. Universal behavior in a generalized model of contagion. *Physical Review Letters*, 92(21):218701, 2004.

[54] S. N. Dorogovtsev, A. V. Goltsev, and J. F. F. Mendes. K-core organization of complex networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 96(4):040601, 2006.

[55] S. N. Dorogovtsev, A. V. Goltsev, and J. F. F. Mendes. Critical phenomena in complex networks. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 80:1275–1335, 2008.

[56] P. G. Drazin. *Nonlinear Systems*, volume 10. Cambridge University Press, 1992.

[57] R. Durrett. *Random Graph Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2007.

[58] R. Durrett. Some features of the spread of epidemics and information on a random graph. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(10):4491–4498, 2010.

[59] R. Durrett, J. P. Gleeson, A. L. Lloyd, P. J. Mucha, F. Shi, D. Sivakoff, J. E. Socolar, and C. Varghese. Graph fission in an evolving voter model. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109(10):3682–3687, 2012.

[60] K. T. Eames and M. J. Keeling. Modeling dynamic and network heterogeneities in the spread of sexually transmitted diseases. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 99(20):13330–13335, 2002.

[61] J. Epperlain, A.-L. Do, T. Gross, and S. Siegmund. Meso-scale obstructions to stability of 1D center manifolds for networks of coupled differential equations with symmetric Jacobian. *Physica D*, 261:1–7, 2013.

[62] G. B. Ermentrout and D. H. Terman. *Mathematical Foundations of Neuroscience*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 2010.

[63] J. D. Farmer, S. A. Kauffman, and N. H. Packard. Autocatalytic replication of polymers. *Physica D*, 22:50–67, 1986.

[64] M. Feinberg. Lectures on chemical reaction networks. Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin; available at `http://crnt.engineering.osu.edu/LecturesOnReactionNetworks`, 1979.

[65] K. S. Fink, G. Johnson, T. Carroll, D. Mar, and L. Pecora. Three coupled oscillators as a universal probe of synchronization stability in coupled oscillator arrays. *Physical Review E*, 61:5080–5090, 2000.

[66] N. E. Friedkin and E. C. Johnsen. *Social Influence Network Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2011.

[67] S. Funk, M. Salathé, and V. A. A. Jansen. Modelling the influence of human behaviour on the spread of infectious diseases: A review. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 7(50):1247–1256, 2010.

[68] P. M. Gade and C.-K. Hu. Synchronous chaos in coupled map lattices with small-world interactions. *Physical Review E*, 62(5):6409–6413, 2000.

[69] P. Gai and S. Kapadia. Contagion in financial networks. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 466:2401–2423, 2010.

[70] M. Garavello and B. Piccoli. *Traffic Flow on Networks*. American Institute of Mathematical Sciences, 2008.

[71] D. T. Gillespie. Exact stochastic simulation of coupled chemical reactions. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry*, 81(25):2340–2361, 1977.

[72] J. P. Gleeson. Cascades on correlated and modular random networks. *Physical Review E*, 77(4):046117, 2008.

[73] J. P. Gleeson. High-accuracy approximation of binary-state dynamics on networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 107(6):068701, 2011.

[74] J. P. Gleeson. Binary-state dynamics on complex networks: pair approximation and beyond. *Physical Review X*, 3(2):021004, 2013.

[75] J. P. Gleeson and D. J. Cahalane. An analytical approach to cascades on random networks. In *SPIE Fourth International Symposium on Fluctuations and Noise*, pages 66010W–66010W. International Society for Optics and Photonics, 2007.

[76] J. P. Gleeson and D. J. Cahalane. Seed size strongly affects cascades on random networks. *Physical Review E*, 75(5):056103, 2007.

[77] J. P. Gleeson, S. Melnik, J. A. Ward, M. A. Porter, and P. J. Mucha. Accuracy of mean-field theory for dynamics on real-world networks. *Physical Review E*, 85(2):026106, 2012.

[78] J. P. Gleeson, J. A. Ward, K. P. O'Sullivan, and W. T. Lee. Competition-induced criticality in a model of meme popularity. *Physical Review Letters*, 112:048701, 2014.

[79] M. Golubitsky and R. Lauterbach. Bifurcations from synchrony in homogeneous networks: Linear theory. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 8(1):40–75, 2009.

[80] M. Golubitsky and I. Stewart. Patterns of synchrony in coupled cell networks with multiple arrows. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 4(1):78–100, 2005.

[81] J. Gómez-Gardeñes, S. Gómez, A. Arenas, and Y. Moreno. Explosive synchronization transitions in scale-free networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 106:128701, 2011.

[82] J. Gómez-Gardeñes and Y. Moreno. From scale-free to Erdös-Rényi networks. *Physical Review E*, 73:056124, 2006.

[83] M. Granovetter. Threshold models of collective behavior. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 83(6):1420–1443, 1978.

[84] P. Grassberger. On the critical behavior of the general epidemic process and dynamical percolation. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 63:157–172, 1983.

[85] T. Gross and B. Blasius. Adaptive coevolutionary networks: a review. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 5(20):259–271, 2008.

[86] T. Gross, C. J. D. DLima, and B. Blasius. Epidemic dynamics on an adaptive network. *Physical Review Letters*, 96(20):208701, 2006.

[87] J. Guckenheimer and P. Holmes. *Nonlinear Oscillations, Dynamical Systems, and Bifurcations of Vector Fields*. Number 42 in Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY, 1983.

[88] S. Gupta, A. Campa, and S. Ruffo. Kuramoto model of synchronization: Equilibrium and nonequilibrium aspects. arXiv:1403.2083, 2014.

[89] A. Hackett and J. P. Gleeson. Cascades on clique-based graphs. *Physical Review E*, 87(6):062801, 2013.

[90] L. Hébert-Dufresne, O. Patterson-Lomba, G. M. Goerg, and B. M. Althouse. Pathogen mutation modeled by competition between site and bond percolation. *Physical Review Letters*, 110:108103, 2013.

[91] H. W. Hethcote. The mathematics of infectious diseases. *SIAM Review*, 42(4):599–653, 2000.

[92] T. Hoffmann, M. A. Porter, and R. Lambiotte. Generalized master equations for non-Poisson dynamics on networks. *Physical Review E*, 86:046102, 2012.

[93] T. Hoffmann, M. A. Porter, and R. Lambiotte. Random walks on stochastic temporal networks. In *Temporal Networks*, pages 295–314. Springer-Verlag, 2013.

[94] R. Holley and T. M. Liggett. Ergodic theorems for weakly interacting infinite systems and the voter model. *Annals of Probability*, 3(4):643–663, 1975.

[95] P. Holme. Model versions and fast algorithms for network epidemiology. arXiv:1403.1011, 2014.

[96] P. Holme and M. E. J. Newman. Nonequilibrium phase transition in the coevolution of networks and opinions. *Physical Review E*, 74:056108, 2006.

[97] P. Holme and J. Saramäki. Temporal networks. *Physics Reports*, 519(3):97–125, 2012.

[98] P. Holme and J. Saramäki, editors. *Temporal Networks*. Springer-Verlag, 2013.

[99] T. R. Hurd and J. P. Gleeson. A framework for analyzing contagion in banking networks. arXiv:1110.4312, 2011.

[100] T. R. Hurd and J. P. Gleeson. On Watts cascade model with random link weights. *Journal of Complex Networks*, 1(1):25–43, 2013.

[101] T. Ichinomiya. Frequency synchronization in a random oscillator network. *Physical Review E*, 70:026116, 2004.

[102] T. Ichinomiya. Path-integral approach to dynamics in a sparse random network. *Physical Review E*, 72:016109, 2005.

[103] F. Karimi and P. Holme. Threshold model of cascades in empirical temporal networks. *Physica A*, 392:3476–3483, 2013.

[104] M. Karsai, M. Kivelä, R. K. Pan, K. Kaski, J. Kerész, A.-L. Barabási, and J. Saramäki. Small but slow world: How network topology and burstiness slow down spreading. *Physical Review E*, 83:025102(R), 2011.

[105] M. Karsai, N. Perra, and A. Vespignani. The emergence and role of strong ties in time-varying communication networks. arXiv:1303.5966, 2013.

[106] S. A. Kauffman. Metabolic stability and epigenesis in randomly constructed genetic nets. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 22(3):437–467, 1969.

[107] E. Kenah and J. M. Robins. Second look at the spread of epidemics on networks. *Physical Review E*, 76:036113, 2007.

[108] H. Kesten. What is ... percolation. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, 53(5):572–573, 2006.

[109] M. Kivelä, A. Arenas, M. Barthelemy, J. P. Gleeson, Y. Moreno, and M. A. Porter. Multilayer networks. arXiv:1309.7233, 2014.

[110] E. D. Kolaczyk. *Statistical Analysis of Network Data: Methods and Notes*. Springer-Verlag, 2009.

[111] Y. Kuramoto. *Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence*. Dover Press, 1984.

[112] Y. M. Lai and M. A. Porter. Noise-induced synchronization, desynchronization, and clustering in globally coupled nonidentical oscillators. *Physical Review E*, 88:012905, 2013.

[113] R. Lambiotte and S. Redner. Dynamics of vacillating voters. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, page L100001, 2007.

[114] R. Lambiotte, V. Salnikov, and M. Rosvall. Effect of memory on the dynamics of random walks on networks. arXiv:1401.0447, 2014.

[115] D.-S. Lee. Synchronization transition in scale-free networks: Clusters of synchrony. *Physical Review E*, 72:026208, 2005.

[116] S. H. Lee and P. Holme. Exploring maps with greedy navigators. *Physical Review Letters*, 108:128701, 2012.

[117] S. A. Levin and R. Durrett. From individuals to epidemics. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 351(1347):1615–1621, 1996.

[118] T. M. Liggett. *Interacting particle systems*. Springer, 2005.

[119] J. Lindquist, J. Ma, P. van den Driessche, and F. H. Willeboordse. Effective degree network disease models. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 62(2):143–164, 2011.

[120] S. Liu, N. Perra, M. Karsai, and A. Vespignani. Controlling contagion processes in time-varying networks. arXiv:1309.7031, 2013.

[121] E. López, R. Parshani, R. Cohen, S. Carmi, and S. Havlin. Limited path percolation in complex networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 99:188701, 2007.

[122] D. Lusher, J. Koskinen, and G. Robins. *Exponential Random Graph Models for Social Networks*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

[123] R. Lyons. Statistics, politics, and policy. *The Spread of Evidence-Poor Medicine via Flawed Social-Network Analysis*, 2(1):2, 2011.

[124] N. Malik and P. J. Mucha. Role of social environment and social clustering in spread of opinions in coevolving networks. *Chaos*, 23(4):043123, 2013.

[125] V. Marceau, P.-A. Noël, L. Hébert-Dufresne, A. Allard, and L. J. Dubé. Adaptive networks: Coevolution of disease and topology. *Physical Review E*, 82(3):036116, 2010.

[126] N. Masuda and V. M. E. Konstantin Klemm. Temporal networks: Slowing down diffusion by long lasting interactions. arXiv:1305.2938, 2013.

[127] Mathematical and Theoretical Biological Institute. Tech reports archive. `http://mtbi.asu.edu/research/archive` (downloaded 24 November 2013).

[128] N. McCullen, A. Rucklidge, C. Bale, T. Foxon, and W. Gale. Multiparameter models of innovation diffusion on complex networks. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 12(1):515–532, 2013.

[129] S. Melnik, M. A. Porter, P. J. Mucha, and J. P. Gleeson. Dynamics on modular networks with heterogeneous correlations. *Chaos, in press (arXiv:1207.1809)*, 2014.

[130] S. Melnik, J. A. Ward, J. P. Gleeson, and M. A. Porter. Multi-stage complex contagions. *Chaos*, 23(1):013124, 2013.

[131] M. Mezard and A. Montanari. *Information, Physics, and Computation*. Oxford University Press, 2009.

[132] P. V. Mieghem. Exact Markovian SIR and SIS epidemics on networks and an upper bound for the epidemic threshold. arXiv:1402.1731, 2014.

[133] J. C. Miller. A note on a paper by Erik Volz: SIR dynamics in random networks. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 62(3):349–358, 2011.

[134] J. C. Miller and I. Z. Kiss. Epidemic spread in networks: Existing methods and current challenges. arXiv:1403.1957, 2014.

[135] E. Mones, N. A. M. Araújo, T. Vicsek, and H. J. Herrmann. Shock waves on complex networks. arXiv:1402.4302, 2014.

[136] Y. Moreno, M. Nekovee, and A. F. Pacheco. Dynamics of rumor spreading in complex networks. *Physical Review E*, 69(6):066130, 2004.

[137] A. E. Motter and R. Albert. Networks in motion. *Physics Today*, 65:43–48, April 2012.

[138] M. E. J. Newman. *Networks: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2010.

[139] T. Nishikawa and A. E. Motter. Network synchronization landscape reveals compensatory structures, quantization, and the positive effect of negative interactions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(23):10342–10347, 2010.

[140] T. Nishikawa, A. E. Motter, Y.-C. Lai, and F. C. Hoppensteadt. Heterogeneity in oscillator networks: Are smaller worlds easier to synchronize? *Physical Review Letters*, 91:014101, 2003.

[141] P.-A. Noël, A. Allard, L. Hébert-Dufresne, V. Marceau, and L. J. Dubé. Propagation on networks: An exact alternative perspective. *Physical Review E*, 85(3):031118, 2012.

[142] P.-A. Noël, C. D. Brummitt, and R. M. D'Souza. Controlling self-organizing dynamics on networks using models that self-organize. *Physical Review Letters*, 111:078701, 2013.

[143] P. Oliver, G. Marwell, and R. Teixeira. A theory of the critical mass. i. interdependence, group heterogeneity, and the production of collective action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3):522–556, 1985.

[144] G. Palla, I. Derényi, I. Farkas, and T. Vicsek. Uncovering the overlapping community structure of complex networks in nature and society. *Nature*, 435:814–818, 2005.

[145] R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani. Epidemic spreading in scale-free networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 86(14):3200, 2001.

[146] L. M. Pecora and T. L. Carroll. Master stability functions for synchronized coupled systems. *Physical Review Letters*, 80(10):2109–2112, 1998.

[147] T. Pereira, S. van Strien, and J. S. W. Lamb. Dynamics of coupled maps in heterogeneous random networks. arXiv:1308.5526, 2013.

[148] F. J. Pérez-Reche, J. L. Ludlam, S. N. Taraskin, and C. A. Gilligan. Synergy in spreading processes: From exploitative to explorative foraging strategies. *Physical Review Letters*, 106:218701, 2011.

[149] N. Perra, A. Baronchelli, D. Mocanu, B. Gonçalves, R. Pastor-Satorras, and A. Vespignani. Random walks and search in time-varying networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 109:238701, 2012.

[150] N. Perra, B. Gonçalves, R. Pastor-Satorras, and A. Vespignani. Activity driven modeling of time varying networks. *Scientific Reports*, 2:469, 2012.

[151] P. Piedrahíta, J. Borge-Holthoefer, Y. Moreno, and A. Arenas. Modeling self-sustained activity cascades in socio-technical networks. *Europhysics Letters*, 104:48004, 2013.

[152] A. Pikovsky and M. Rosenblum. Synchronization. *Scholarpedia*, 2(12):1459, 2007.

[153] A. Pikovsky, M. Rosenblum, and J. Kurths. *Synchronization: A Universal Concept in Nonlinear Sciences*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[154] A. Pomerance, E. Ott, M. Girvan, and W. Losert. The effect of network topology on the stability of discrete state models of genetic control. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106(20):8209–8214, 2009.

[155] M. A. Porter, J.-P. Onnela, and P. J. Mucha. Communities in networks. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, 56(9):1082–1097, 1164–1166, 2009.

[156] E. Pugliese and C. Castellano. Heterogeneous pair approximation for voter models on networks. *Europhysics Letters*, 88(5):58004, 2009.

[157] G. X. Qi, H. B. Huang, C. K. Shen, H. J. Wang, and L. Chen. Predicting the synchronization time in coupled-map networks. *Physical Review E*, 77:056205, 2008.

[158] K. Rajendran and I. G. Kevrekidis. Coarse graining the dynamics of heterogeneous oscillators in networks with spectral gaps. *Physical Review E*, 84:036708, 2011.

[159] J. G. Restrepo, E. Ott, and B. R. Hunt. Onset of synchronization in large networks of coupled oscillators. *Physical Review E*, 71:036151, 2005.

[160] J. Ruths and D. Ruths. Control profiles of complex networks. *Science*, 343(6177):1373–1376, 2014.

[161] S. Sahasrabudhe and A. E. Motter. Rescuing ecosystems from extinction cascades through compensatory perturbations,. *Nature Communications*, 2:170, 2011.

[162] H. Sayama, I. Pestov, J. Schmidt, B. J. Bush, C. Wong, J. Yamanoi, and T. Gross. Modeling complex systems with adaptive networks. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 65(10):1645–1664, 2013.

[163] S. B. Seidman. Network structure and minimum degree. *Social Networks*, 5:269–287, 1983.

[164] F. Sélley, A. Besenyei, I. Z. Kiss, and P. L. Simon. Dynamic control of modern, network-based epidemic models. arXiv:1402.2194, 2014.

[165] J. P. Sethna. *Statistical Mechanics: Entropy, Order Parameters and Complexity*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2006.

[166] C. R. Shalizi and A. C. Thomas. Homophily and contagion are generically confounded in observational social network studies. *Sociological Methods Research*, 40(2):211–239, 2011.

[167] F. Shi, P. J. Mucha, and R. Durrett. Multiopinion coevolving voter model with infinitely many phase transitions. *Physical Review E*, 88:062818, 2013.

[168] J. D. Skufca and E. M. Bollt. Communication and synchronization in disconnected networks with dynamic topology: Moving neighborhood networks. *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering*, 1(2):347–359, 2004.

[169] R. Smith? *Braaaiiinnnsss!: From Academics to Zombies*. University of Ottawa Press, Ottawa, Canada, 2011.

[170] T. A. B. Snijders. The statistical evaluation of social network dynamics. *Sociological Methodology*, 40:361–395, 2001.

[171] T. A. B. Snijders, G. G. Van de Bunt, and C. E. G. Steglich. Introduction to stochastic actor-based models for network dynamics. *Social Networks*, 32:44–60, 2010.

[172] A. Solé-Ribalta, M. De Domenico, N. E. Kouvaris, A. Díaz-Guilera, S. Gómez, and A. Arenas. Spectral properties of the laplacian of multiplex networks. *Physical Review E*, 88:032807, 2013.

[173] V. Sood and S. Redner. Voter model on heterogeneous graphs. *Physical Review Letters*, 94(17):178701, 2005.

[174] B. State. The unequal adoption of equal signs. `https://www.facebook.com/notes/facebook-data-science/the-unequal-adoption-` 2013.

[175] I. Stewart, M. Golubitsky, and M. Pivato. Symmetry groupoids and patterns of synchrony in coupled cell networks. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 2:609–646, 2003.

[176] S. H. Strogatz. *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1994.

[177] S. H. Strogatz. Investigating hemodynamic response variability at the group level using basis functions. *Physica D*, 143:1–20, 2000.

[178] S. H. Strogatz. Exploring complex networks. *Nature*, 410:268–276, March 8 2001.

[179] M. P. H. Stumpf and M. A. Porter. Critical truths about power laws. *Science*, 51:665–666, 2012.

[180] J. Sun, E. M. Bollt, and T. Nishikawa. Master stability functions for coupled nearly identical dynamical systems. *Europhysics Letters*, 85:60011, 2011.

[181] J. Sun, E. M. Bollt, M. A. Porter, and M. S. Dawkins. A mathematical model for the dynamics and synchronization of cows. *Physica D*, 240:1497–1509, 2011.

[182] T. Takaguchi, N. Masuda, and P. Holme. Bursty communication patterns facilitate spreading in a threshold-based epidemic dynamics. *PLoS One*, 8(7):e68629, 2013.

[183] T. J. Taylor and I. Z. Kiss. Interdependency and hierarchy of exact epidemic models on networks. arXiv:1212.3124, 2012.

[184] M. Tizzoni, P. Bajardi, C. Poletto, J. Ramasco, D. Balcan, B. Goncalves, N. Perra, V. Colizza, and A. Vespignani. Real-time numerical forecast of global epidemic spreading: case study of 2009 A/H1N1pdm. *BMC Medicine*, 10(1):165, 2012.

[185] A. L. Traud, P. J. Mucha, and M. A. Porter. Social structure of Facebook networks. *Physica A*, 391(16):4165–4180, 2012.

[186] F. Vazquez and V. M. Eguíluz. Analytical solution of the voter model on uncorrelated networks. *New Journal of Physics*, 10(6):063011, 2008.

[187] F. Vázquez, P. L. Krapivsky, and S. Redner. Constrained opinion dynamics: Freezing and slow evolution. *Journal of*

Physics A: Mathematical and General, 36:L61–L68, 2003.
[188] A. Vespignani. Modelling dynamical processes in complex socio-technical systems. *Nature Physics*, 8:32–39, 2012.
[189] L. Warnke and O. Riordan. Explosive percolation is continuous. *Science*, 333:322–324, 2011.
[190] L. Warnke and O. Riordan. Achlioptas process phase transitions are continuous. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 22:1450–1464, 2012.
[191] D. J. Watts. A simple model of global cascades on random networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 99(9):5766–5771, 2002.
[192] L. Weng, F. Menczer, and Y.-Y. Ahn. Virality prediction and community structure in social networks. *Scientific Reports*, 3:2522, 2013.
[193] G. B. Whitham. *Linear and Nonlinear Waves*. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Wiley-Interscience, New York, NY, 1974.
[194] O. Yağan and V. Gligor. Analysis of complex contagions in random multiplex networks. *Physical Review E*, 86(3):036103, 2012.
[195] G. Zschaler and T. Gross. Largenet2: An object-oriented programming library for simulating large adaptive networks. *Bioinformatics*, 29(2):277–278, 2013.
[196] The complication that we will discuss the most are time-dependent network structures (i.e., temporal networks), because consideration of the time scales of dynamical processes on networks versus those of the dynamics of the networks themselves is a crucial modeling issue.
[197] One can also examine weighted networks with a minimal extension of this formalism.
[198] Recall that so-called "explosive" percolation is actually a steep but continuous transition [42, 189, 190].
[199] Naturally, it is also important to consider the effects of memory on dynamical processes on networks [114].
[200] Note that there are several ways to define a "cascade", especially in the context of applications. When studying purely empirical data, one might wish to define a "cascade" based on a specified minimum fraction of nodes that become infected or a specified minimum fraction that become infected within a specified amount of time. In practical situations, it can be important to consider the "infection" of people with a meme within a finite duration of time, so the $t \to \infty$ limit that one typically considers to compute cascade sizes is too restrictive on some occasions. (For example, this is relevant in the commercial sector.)